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At the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642 Charles I owned one of Europe's most important collections of Italian art of the High Renaissance and early Baroque (from the period 1500–1640). Within ten years he had been beheaded and almost the entire collection sold (the major exceptions being Raphael's tapestry cartoons and Mantegna's Triumphs of Caesar). After the Restoration in 1660 Charles II set about reassembling his father's picture collection where possible, and where it was not, acquiring comparable works. Subsequent monarchs, at least until the death of Prince Albert in 1861, continued this work, all to a greater or lesser extent inspired by the example of Charles I. While it is possible to reconstruct and appreciate the coherent character of the collection Charles I formed in a mere twenty years, it is in some ways more difficult to gain a sense of the collection his successors took two hundred years to accumulate. The present publication and the exhibition it accompanies provide for the first time an opportunity to do just this. The paintings included here are quite simply the best of their type in the Royal Collection.

The Italian drawings in the Royal Collection from the same period are among the finest in the world, but the history of the acquisition of the drawings collection is almost completely unrelated to the same history for the paintings. Nor can the distribution of paintings be exactly matched (especially in areas such as the Veneto, where drawing was a less important activity than elsewhere in Italy). However, the selection process has provided an opportunity for less familiar areas of the collection to be explored and for well-known sheets to be seen in a new context.

The story of the acquisition (and in some cases reacquisition) of the collection of paintings and drawings is told in the Introduction. The Catalogue presents the paintings and drawings according to their place and date of creation, arranged under four broad headings, three for the sixteenth century – Florence and Rome, the Courts of Northern Italy, and Venice and the Veneto – and one for the seventeenth century. The prominence of the ‘Northern Courts’ reflects Charles I’s acquisition of most of the collection of the Dukes of Mantua in 1627–32; the preponderance of early seventeenth-century painting in the final section reminds us that Charles ceased collecting in 1642. But otherwise these groupings, or something very like them, could be seen in any comparably rich collection.

A project as ambitious as this could never have the catalogue it deserves without additional funding. We are therefore extremely grateful to Sir Harry Djanogly, who has supported this publication most generously.
INTRODUCTION

‘Art becomes a piece of State’
Italian Paintings and Drawings
and Royal Collectors
In 1624 Henry Wotton, former British Ambassador to Venice, wrote of the benefits in the ancient world of creating statues of deserving men; such art, he argued, was not ‘a bare and transitory entertainment of the Eye . . . But had also a secret and strong Influence, even into the advancement of the Monarchie, by continual representation of vertuous examples; so as in that point, art became a piece of State’.

There is no doubt in Wotton’s mind which nation in the modern world created art capable of this ‘secret and strong influence’. In his address to Charles I in 1633, he told the King that ‘the most splendid of all your entertainments, is your love of excellent Artificers, and works: wherewith either Art both of Picture and Sculpture you have so adorned your Palaces, that Italy (the greatest Mother of Elegant Arts) or at least (after the Grecians) the principal Nurse, may seem by your magnificence to be translated into England.

Art in this serious and improving sense meant Italian art.

No single acquisition within the history of the Royal Collection exemplifies this high-minded attitude to art better than the series of seven full-scale drawings or cartoons for tapestries by Raphael, depicting subjects from the Acts of the Apostles, now displayed in the Victoria and Albert Museum (fig. 1; see also no. 12, a preparatory drawing for the cartoons). These seminal works of the Italian Renaissance form part of the story of the taste of almost every reign discussed in these pages. In 1542 Henry VIII acquired a set of the tapestries made after Raphael’s designs for Pope Leo X. Charles I acquired the cartoons themselves while still Prince of Wales. They were one of the most important Royal possessions that Cromwell decided to reserve for the use of the State at the Commonwealth Sale, though Charles II reportedly considered selling them to the French after the Restoration. In 1699 William III commissioned Sir Christopher Wren and William Talman to remodel a long gallery at Hampton Court, specifically designed to display the cartoons (fig. 18). During the Georgian period they were taken as models for the emerging British school of painting, admired even by someone as sceptical about Italian art as William Hogarth. In 1763 George III transferred them to London to decorate Queen Charlotte’s Saloon in the recently acquired Buckingham House, and was attacked in the House of Commons by John Wilkes for removing them from public view. In 1804 the King returned them to their purpose-built setting at Hampton Court. In 1865, soon after Prince Albert’s death and presumably as a tribute to his great love of Italian art, Queen Victoria offered the cartoons on long-term loan to the newly founded South Kensington Museum (later renamed the Victoria and Albert Museum), where they have remained ever since. By this date it was not only art but also artistic education for the general public which had become a ‘piece of State’.

The Tudors

Exchanges of works of art have often played a role in political alliances. Early in 1504 Henry VII sent ambassadors to Italy to present Guidobaldo, the eldest son of Federigo da Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino, with the Order of the Garter. This was part of Henry’s plan to persuade Pope Julius II to allow the marriage of the Prince of Wales, the future Henry VIII, to his brother’s widow, Catherine of Aragon. In 1506 Baldassare Castiglione, later author of the highly influential Book of the Courtier (1528), set out for England to act as proxy for the Duke at his ceremony of installation as Knight of the Garter at Windsor. There is an old tradition (although not documented) that Castiglione brought with him, as a gift for the King, the small panel of St George and the Dragon by Raphael (National Gallery of Art, Washington DC) painted in c.1505–1506, in which St George wears the Garter around his left leg (fig. 2). If this story were true, this would have been the first major Italian Renaissance painting to enter the Royal Collection. However, a hundred years later the painting was owned by the 4th Earl of Pembroke, from whom Charles I acquired it in exchange for a book of Holbein drawings.

Henry VIII used Italian sculptors, painters and craftsmen for his building projects (though most of their work has now disappeared) and for his parents’ tomb, which survives in Westminster Abbey, created in 1512–18 by the sculptor Pietro Torrigiani (1472–1528). Girolamo da Treviso was invited to London by Henry VIII in 1538 to work as a military engineer and was killed by a cannon shot when the English besieged Boulogne. His Protestant Allegory (fig. 3), described in Henry VIII’s 1547 inventory as a ‘table [i.e. panel] of the busshop of Rome and the foure
Fig. 1. Raphael, *The Sacrifice at Lystra*, bodycolour on paper mounted on canvas, 350 × 550 cm (Royal Collection, RL 12949; on loan to the Victoria and Albert Museum, London)
Fig. 2 Raphael, *St George and the Dragon*, oil on panel, 28.5 × 21.5 cm (National Gallery of Art, Washington dc)
Euangelistes casting stones upon him", is the only painting by an Italian artist to remain in the Collection from this period. At this date tapestries were more valued as wall decoration than paintings. The first exposure to the magnificence of the Italian High Renaissance in England came in 1542, when two sets of tapestries, later weavings from the sets commissioned by Pope Leo X, arrived at Henry VIII’s court: the Acts of the Apostles, designed by Raphael (see above), and the Triumph of the Gods (known as "The Antiques"), designed by two members of his studio, Giovanni Francesco Penni and Giovanni da Udine. Henry VIII’s 1547 inventory records more than 2,700 tapestries and they remained the most expensive furnishings for palaces. Even a century later, when the Royal Collection contained masterpieces of Italian painting, the tapestries were the highest valued items in the Commonwealth Sale.

During Henry VIII’s reign the "privy" [private] gallery developed in English palace design into a long connecting space for informal conversation and relaxation, where paintings were displayed. Throughout the sixteenth century such spaces were generally and principally used for the display of portraits, demonstrating the lineage and alliances of the monarch, with a shift away from religious subject matter following the Reformation. While English patrons might have looked first to the Low Countries or Germany for their portrait painters, they also began to acknowledge the Italians’ distinctive contribution to the art form. Titian’s portrait of Philip II had been sent over by the Queen of Hungary to Mary I in 1553, unfortunately only on a temporary basis. Mary of Hungary wrote (in French): ‘it will serve to tell her what he is like, if she will put it in a proper light and look at it from a distance, as all Titian’s paintings have to be looked at.’ This advice suggests that the English audience needed guidance in how to appreciate Italian painting. When the miniaturist Nicholas Hilliard first drew Queen Elizabeth I in 1572, he recorded that ‘after showing me howe shee notied great difference of shadowing in the works, and diversity of Drawers of sundry nations, and that the Italians had the name to be cunningest, and to drawe best, shadowed not, Requiring of me the reason of it…’ In 1575 Federico Zuccaro (nos. 10, 26) paid a brief visit to the court of Elizabeth I, probably at the request of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and painted both of them. The full-length portraits are lost, but the drawing of the Queen (British Museum, London; fig. 4) is a rare ad vivum likeness; its allegorical ermine and snakes are similar to those appearing in Zuccaro’s Calumny (no. 10).
THE STUARTS

Lord Salisbury claimed that Anne of Denmark, the consort of James I, preferred ‘dead pictorres in a paltry Gallery’ to the company of living people.13 Both of Anne’s sons, Prince Henry and Charles I, clearly inherited their mother’s taste for art. After Henry VIII’s break with Rome and Elizabeth I’s excommunication in 1570, Venice was the only Italian state with which the English had a political understanding. The Anglo–Spanish peace treaty of 1604 forged stronger links between England and the Continent and made travel easier. It was at this time that a succession of astute English ambassadors served in Venice – Sir Henry Wotton in 1604–1609, 1616–19 and 1621–3; Sir Dudley Carleton from 1610 to 1615, and Sir Isaac Wake from 1624 to 1630. All were involved in negotiations for the export of works of art in addition to their other duties. When it came to the export of the Gonzaga collection from Venice for Charles I, the Doge and Senate offered every assistance to Wake, adding: ‘not onley in that, but in any thing else, wth shall be required in his Ma’m name, or for his service, they will always be ready to serve him wth alacrity.’

In 1608 Wotton wrote to Lord Salisbury: ‘There is also a figure (I take it) of Prometheus devoured by the eagle, done by Giacobo Palma in concurrence with Titiano, which for the emulation between two painters (both of no small name) I dare almost say to be worthy of a corner in one of your Lordship’s galleries.’15 Lord Salisbury acquired the painting, Palma Giovane’s Prometheus (fig. 5), and gave it to the young Henry, Prince of Wales, two years later; it is still in the Royal Collection.16 In the same letter Wotton discusses a portrait by Leonardo Donato in a way which suggests that Venetian painting made particular demands on English viewers: the portrait, he writes, is ‘done truly and naturally but roughly, alla Venetiana, and therefore to be set at some distance from the sight’. In another letter Wotton praises a Titian for ‘being so round, that I know not whether I shall call it a piece of sculpture, or picture, and so lively, that a man would be tempted to doubt whether nature or art had made it’.17 Henry, Prince of Wales, had clearly developed a taste for Italian art: shortly after acquiring the Prometheus he spent £408 17s 6d on a shipment of Venetian paintings direct from Italy, which probably included works by Tintoretto, Bassano and Palma Giovane.18 On 26 January 1610 Sir Walter Cope wrote to Carleton: ‘If you meete with any auncient Masterpeeces of paintinge at a reasonable hand, you cannot send a thinge more gracious to the Prince [Henry, Prince of Wales], or my Lord Treasurer [Lord Salisbury]; although he adds that for him ‘their inventions are a little too light, not fitting for any place of gravitie’.19
Meanwhile, the Venetian ambassador in London, Marc Antonio Correr, reported that Prince Henry was ‘paying special attention to the adorning of a most beautiful gallery of very fine pictures, ancient and modern, the larger part brought out of Venice’. The Prince’s Surveyor, Inigo Jones, probably remodelled the gallery of St James’s Palace between 1609 and 1610; for the first time large-scale religious and mythological subjects – Bacchus, Ceres and Venus, Prometheus – were seen alongside the more usual portraits. In 1615 Carleton sent another large shipment of Venetian paintings gathered together by the Flemish merchant and dealer Daniel Nys, for Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset. When Somerset was arrested later that year on suspicion of murder, the collection was bought by the Earl of Arundel and Lord Danvers. It is probable that the ‘Labyrinth’ by Tintoretto mentioned in this shipment is the Pleasure Garden with a Maze (no. 79), now attributed to Pozzoserrato. It has a Renaissance-style frame with gilt scrolling foliage on black; some examples of this type can be dated to the 1630s.

When plans were laid to marry Prince Henry to Caterina de’ Medici, the daughter of Grand Duke Ferdinando I of Tuscany, the negotiations involved a gift of paintings, including one by Beccafumi, which Prince Henry wanted to place in a particular room so that it could be seen to better effect, and portraits of famous Italians, including Pico della Mirandola, Machiavelli and Castruccio. Henry also asked for sculptures by Giambologna and in 1612 received a number of small bronze casts from his models by Pietro Tacca. When they were unpacked at Richmond Palace, Prince Henry excitedly seized a bronze and kissed it, and refused to allow his younger brother, Prince Charles (then aged 12), to have one as a plaything. Henry gained a reputation as a discriminating collector who wanted to build up a princely collection in emulation of that of Rudolf II in Prague or the Florentine court under the Medici grand dukes. When he died at the age of 18 in 1612 his collection, which included fine Italian and Netherlandish paintings, as well as coins, medals and books, was inherited by his younger brother, Charles, and helped to form his taste.

Charles I: ‘The Greatest Amateur of Paintings Among the Princes of the World’

During the protracted negotiations for the marriage of Prince Charles to the King of Spain’s sister, the Infanta María, the future King sought to break the deadlock by visiting Madrid in 1623 and wooing the Infanta in person. He was accompanied by some of the most knowledgeable and important art collectors associated with the English court: George Villiers, the Marquis (later Duke) of Buckingham; his agent, Balthasar Gerbier; Endymion Porter; Francis Cottington; James Hamilton, Earl of Arran and 3rd Marquess, later 1st Duke, of Hamilton; and Tobie Matthew. King Philip IV’s collection was at this date the most extensive in Europe and his Venetian paintings in particular must have dazzled his visitors. The young King presented Charles with some spectacularly generous gifts: Titian’s Jupiter and Antiope (which hung in the Pardo Palace in Madrid and was thus known as the ‘Venus del Pardo’; Louvre, fig. 6), Titian’s Emperor Charles V with a Hound (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and Correggio’s Holy Family with the Infant Baptist (probably that in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Orléans; see fig. 6a). There was even a suggestion that Philip was intending to give Charles three of Titian’s magnificent late poesie (presumably in the event of a successful outcome to the marriage negotiations): Diana and Callisto and Diana and Actaeon (both in the Sutherland collection, National Gallery of Scotland) and the Rape of Europa (Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston). Charles also found opportunities to buy works: Titian’s Nude Girl in a Fur Wrap (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and Allegory of Alfonso d’Avalos (Louvre) and a copy of his Christ Bearing the Cross. He subsequently commissioned numerous copies of pictures in Spain, particularly those by Titian. More than any other event in his life this visit must have given Charles the determination to assemble an art collection to compete with Philip’s.

It was while in Spain that Charles concluded the negotiations through agents to purchase seven of the Raphael tapestry cartoons (see p. 12 above) from a Genoese collection for the relatively low price of £300, probably to provide designs for the recently founded tapestry works at Mortlake. The cartoons may have been the pre-eminent representatives of Italian art in England, but they were treated as functional objects. They had been cut into strips to be used directly on the looms, as was customary with the low-warp method of tapestry weaving. After Charles’s death the strips were stored in wooden boxes in the Banqueting House at Whitehall and permanently reassembled only in the 1690s.

Charles I was encouraged in his collecting by a small group of the nobility, many of whom had been at the courts of his father and elder brother. Their town houses were concentrated for the most part in a relatively small area of London around Whitehall Palace and the Strand. The most serious and knowledgeable collector was Lord Arundel, who was deeply interested in European and especially Italian culture, and in the ancient civilisation of Rome. George Villiers was a favourite of James I and then of Charles I, and was created Duke of Buckingham
in 1623. His meteoric rise at court was matched by the speed with which he accumulated a collection of old master and contemporary art to be displayed in York House on the Strand. Buckingham owed much of his success as a collector to the advice of Balthasar Gerbier, a miniature painter, architect and dealer from Middelburg in Zeeland. Buckingham was also a friend of Rubens and was instrumental in attracting other artists to London, including Gerrit van Honthorst and Orazio Gentileschi (see nos. 104–5).

Both the 2nd Marquess and his son, James, Earl of Arran and 3rd Marquess (later Duke) of Hamilton, were distinguished collectors. The latter married Buckingham’s niece and hoped to succeed Buckingham as royal favourite. Another was Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of Northumberland, who in 1640–47 rented York House from Buckingham’s widow before moving to Suffolk (later Northumberland) House. Charles I relied upon advisers such as Inigo Jones, Endymion Porter, and Nicholas Lanier, and a network of art dealers, agents and ambassadors placed in strategic cities across Europe. A crucial character was Daniel Nys, a Flemish merchant and the foremost art dealer in Venice, with his own important collection and a wide range of contacts, including artists such as Domenico Fetti (see nos. 100–102), and fellow collectors such as Ferdinando Gonzaga and the Earl of Arundel. Nys acted as agent for the Earl of Somerset and became the key player in the negotiations for the purchase of the Gonzaga collection (see below). After his bankruptcy in 1631 Nys sought to move to England under the protection of Arundel, who bought his famous ebony cabinet containing antique and Renaissance intaglios and cameos in 1637.33

Such men ‘traded’ on their collections, exchanging paintings with the King or making outright gifts in the hope of gaining political advantage. The 3rd Earl of Pembroke gave the King a Giovanni Bellini and a Parmigianino in return for a ‘little Judith’ by Giorgione, then thought to be by Raphael; Pembroke’s brother, the 4th Earl, gave Raphael’s St George and the Dragon (National Gallery of Art, Washington dc; see above) in exchange for a group of Holbein portrait drawings, which he then gave to Arundel. Charles I acquired Leonardo da Vinci’s St John the Baptist (Louvre) from Roger de Liancourt, a Gentleman of the Bedchamber to Louis XIII, in exchange for Holbein’s portrait of Erasmus (Louvre) and a Titian religious painting which had belonged to John Donne. We can assume that in every one of these examples of royal barter, the trading partner gained prestige and intimacy with the King. Art and politics were indissolubly linked. An understanding of art became a
useful accomplishment for a courtier: Rubens was wisely chosen by the Archduchess Isabella as her ambassador to the court of Charles I.

Charles I was acknowledged to be a discerning as well as passionate collector, a reputation which enhanced the prestige of his court. As early as 1622 Girolamo Lando reported to the Doge and Senate of Venice that Prince Charles 'loves old paintings, especially those of our province and city'. Rubens called Charles I 'the greatest amateur of paintings among the princes of the world'. For many this activity also brought benefit at home. Lucy Hutchinson contrasted the court of James I, with its 'fools and bawds, mimics and catamites', with that of his 'temperate, chaste and serious' son, Charles I, where 'men of learning and ingenuity in all arts were in esteem, and received encouragement from the king, who was a most excellent judge and a great lover of paintings, carvings, gravings, and many other ingenuities'. Henry Wotton's remarks about the significance of Charles I's collecting are quoted at the beginning of this Introduction.

Charles I's acquisition of the Gonzaga collection in 1629–32 is the most famous episode in seventeenth-century British collecting. English connoisseurs had long known of the splendours of the Gonzaga court at Mantua. The work of Giulio Romano seems to have been especially admired: he is the only 'modern' artist mentioned by Shakespeare, who writes in *The Winter's Tale* of 'that rare Italian Master, Iulio romano, who (had he himselfe Eternitie, and could put Breath into his Worke) would beguile Nature of her Custome, so perfectly he is her ape'. Lady Arundel requested a scale model of Giulio's Palazzo Te in 1623. The Gonzaga collection had been built up over centuries; at a stroke Charles acquired the patrimony and something of the status of a famous Italian Renaissance court. Charles I was greatly assisted in his acquisition of the Gonzaga collection by two agents working on his behalf in Italy: Daniel Nys (mentioned above) and Nicholas Lanier, Master of the King's Music. Lanier was already working on behalf of the King in June 1625, when he was preparing to export to England a group of pictures, including the panels of the crucified thieves by Perino del Vaga (no. 4). With the help of Daniel Nys, Lanier saw the Gonzaga collection and reported back to the King. It was Nys who started negotiations with Duke Ferdinando until his death in 1626, and thereafter with his vacillating son, Vincenzo II. In the lists that have survived from this stage in the negotiations the most important paintings, placed in order of price, are Titian's *Twelve Caesars*, followed by Raphael's *Virgin and Child with St Elizabeth and the Infant Baptist* (the
‘Madonna della Perla’, now thought to be by Giulio Romano; Prado; fig. 7); Andrea del Sarto’s Madonna della Scala (Prado); Giulio Romano’s St Jerome (untraced); Correggio’s Venus with Mercury and Cupid (National Gallery, London; fig. 8) and Venus with Satyr and Cupid (Louvre); and Guido Reni’s Toilet of Venus (National Gallery, London). In December 1627, statues and busts were added. By September 1627 at least some of the paintings were moved to Murano in readiness for shipping. The progress of the sale was complicated by Vincenzo’s suspicions that Nys was negotiating for rival Italian powers, such as the Duke of Parma or the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and by the anger of the citizens of Mantua when they learned of the impending spoliation.

With the death of Vincenzo on 25 December 1627 the duchy passed to Charles, Duc de Nevers, who needed funds for his war to secure his succession and had fewer qualms about selling the collection. Nys was able to write in triumph to Endymion Porter in April 1628: ‘I am astounded myself at the success of this negotiation.’ Sir Isaac Wake, the British ambassador in Venice, negotiated exemption from customs duties and, with Lanier, made arrangements for the safe journey of the paintings on the ship Margaret, which set sail on 15 April 1628. Lanier travelled over land with the two Correggio Allegories of Vice and Virtue (Louvre) and the ‘Madonna della Perla’ (fig. 7) which, according to Nys, were ‘the finest pictures in the world, and well worth the money paid for the whole, both on account of their rarity and exquisite beauty’. In his letter to Lord Conway, Wake explained that because the Correggios were in ‘water coulours’ (tempera on canvas) ‘they would not have brooked yr sea’.

It took another year of negotiations for Daniel Nys to persuade Charles of Nevers to include two further groups of work in the sale: the collection of sculpture and Mantegna’s Triumphs of Caesar (fig. 8). This he achieved, at the cost of a further £10,500, in February 1629, when he wrote that ‘the best informed persons told me that I had left the most beautiful behind, and that, not having the Triumph of Caesar, I had nothing at all; this touched me to the core’. Nys promised to send the King drawings of the statues (now in the Royal Library, Windsor) and prints of the Triumphs. In October 1630 Thomas Rowlandson, Wake’s successor as ambassador in Venice, reported to the Lord Treasurer, Sir Richard Weston, that this second shipment of works of art from Mantua was about to leave the city for London. On 25 July 1631 Charles I signed a warrant for £2,454 14s 3d which appears to be the amount still outstanding, although order books of the Clerk of the Pells show payments from December 1630 to February 1633. On 6 August 1632 the last of the statues and pictures were sent on the Assurance.

The myth has developed that everything of importance left Mantua for London, when in fact what remained was lost in the sack of the Palazzo Ducale by German soldiers between July 1630 and September 1631. The cost of the Mantuan acquisition was probably in the region of £30,000.

Nicholas Lanier and Daniel Nys had concluded the deal on behalf of the King but found it difficult to get him to pay for it. Filippo Burlamachi, the King’s moneylender, wrote to Endymion Porter that the £15,000 he was asking for in October 1627 was an impossibly large sum given the cost of the Duke of Buckingham’s disastrous expedition in the same month to relieve the siege of the Isle de Rhé. Although letters from Lord Treasurer Weston show that the King approved the purchases, he was dilatory with his payment, prompting a series of petitioning letters from Nys.

Besides the paintings already mentioned, the purchase included Mantegna’s Dead Christ (possibly the version in the Brera, Milan) and Death of the Virgin (Prado); many works by Giulio Romano, among them the Nativity (Louvre); Dosso Dossi’s Holy Family (no. 32); and a large group of Titians, including the Entombment and Supper at Emmaus (both in the Louvre), the Allocation of Marshal D’Avalos and Venus with the Organ-Player (both in the Prado). There were also works by recent and living Italian painters, including Annibale Carracci’s Butcher’s Shop (Christ Church, Oxford), an important group of works by Domenico Fetti and Giovanni Baglione (see nos. 96, 100–102) and Caravaggio’s famous Death of the Virgin (Louvre), bought by the Duke of Mantua (at Rubens’s suggestion) after it had been sold by the church for which it was painted.

In August 1628 Charles I ordered Lanier, Inigo Jones and William George, Clerk of the Wardrobe, ‘to cause a p[re]sent Inventory to be made of all his M[ajesty’s] Pictures Statues and Meddalls of mettall and Stone’. The inventory must have been necessary because the first part of the Mantuan collection, shipped from Malamocco in April, had arrived in London. This lost document must have informed Abraham van der Doort’s important (if incomplete) inventory of the collection in 1639, which provides a full description of paintings at Whitehall, Charles’s principal residence, and lists those at Greenwich and Nonsuch. A version of the catalogue, probably written c. 1640, also lists pictures in the gallery at St James’s Palace. There is nothing in Van der Doort on the contents of Charles’s other residences, which must have been furnished with paintings: Denmark House (later Somerset House); Hampton Court; Richmond; Oatlands; Windsor Castle; and his lesser houses and hunting lodges.
Fig. 9 Mantegna. The Triumph of Caesar - canvas IV: Bearers of coins and vases, youths leading oxen, trumpeters ('The Vase Bearers'); glue-based medium(s) on canvas, 270 × 280 cm (B.C.I.N. 403561)
A Dutch medallist, Abraham van der Doort (fig. 10) had worked at the court of Rudolf II in Prague before entering the service of Prince Henry in 1611. In May 1625 Charles I made him Overseer or Surveyor of all our pictures of Us, Our Heires and Successors . . . at Whitehall and other our houses of resort.58 His inventory is an invaluable record of the provenance, size, attribution, condition, frames and arrangement of Charles's collection. Each painting from the Gonzaga collection is methodically identified as 'A Mantua peece'. He devised a brand or cipher, which can still be found on Charles I's paintings today, and labels, some of which survive.59 His cautious attributions reflect the high standard of connoisseurship at court: 'said to Be done by Corrigio & by Some esteemed to be a verie good old coppie'; 'an Italian painter as yet unknown', 'said to be of Leonard de Vinci: or out of his Scoule'.

Van der Doort recorded the impact on the Gonzaga collection of its journey to England, especially the damage caused by contact with quicksilver (mercury). Van der Doort mentions several paintings, including Baglione’s Allegory of Charity and Justice Reconciled (no. 96) and Titian’s Emperor Vitellius (lost), which had been ‘defaced’ or ‘utterlie spoyled by quicksilver’.60

Nicholas Lanier’s uncle, Jerome Lanier, treated the paintings and described his methods to Richard Symonds in 1644.61 It is uncertain what exactly happened in the ship’s hold, but it appears from Lanier’s account that the varnish had to be removed.62 In 1631–2 there are records of payments to John de Critz for repairing two paintings by Palma and seven of the set of Emperors’ heads by Titian ‘being likewise much defaced’. It may be that only seven Emperors were hung in St James's gallery because the other four were too damaged; of these, Vitellius was sent to Van Dyck in Brussels, who was paid £20 on 8 August 1632 to paint a replacement and £5 for repairing Galba.63 John de Critz’s son Thomas was paid in 1632/3 for ‘mending and repairing’ ‘a greate old peece of a Musitian’ by Titian and the Correggio’s Venus with Satyr and Cupid (Louvre). In 1636–7 Daniel Soreau repaired paintings by Giulio Romano and in 1637 Richard Greenbury was paid £140 for restoring Mantuan paintings.64

The Mantuan collection of about ninety paintings and two hundred pieces of sculpture was incorporated into the existing royal collection. A coherent arrangement of pictures was created in the gallery at St James’s Palace which matched Giulio Romano’s decorations of the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua.65 This space contained some of the highlights of the Mantuan purchase: Caravaggio’s Death of the Virgin (Louvre; fig. 11), Titian’s Emperors and Giulio Romano’s Emperors on Horseback (no. 39).66

Van Dyck’s astonishing and theatrical equestrian portrait, Charles I with M. de St Antoine (fig. 12) closed one end of the gallery, showing the King as ruler, warrior and knight in the tradition of Antique and Renaissance equestrian monuments, framed by a triumphal arch. The King’s pose, in armour and holding a baton, may have been influenced by Titian’s Emperors and Giulio Romano’s Emperors (no. 39), displayed on the other walls in the gallery. On the opposite wall, facing the Van Dyck, was probably Guido Reni’s Death of Hercules.67

Groups of paintings, however, were broken up: only some of Giulio Romano’s panels from the Cabinet of Caesars were shown here, and just three of the set of four Guido Reni Labours of Hercules. Despite this, the St James’s gallery must have been one of the earliest examples of sophisticated and intelligent picture hanging in England.

Historians of this period have contrasted the court of James I, which was informal, occasionally even undignified, with that of
Charles I, regarded as grave, aloof and private, in imitation of Spanish court etiquette. Under King James decorum was lax and access to the King relatively easy; Charles I revived the court etiquette of Elizabeth I’s reign and, in the 1630s, codified ‘rules and maxims’ for the reformation of the court. Zuane Pesaro, the Venetian Ambassador in England, reported that the King observes a rule of great decorum. The nobles do not enter his apartments in confusion as heretofore, but each rank has its appointed place, and he has declared that he desires the observance of rules and maxims of the late Queen Elizabeth... It is said that he will set apart a day for public audience, and he does not wish anyone to be introduced to him unless sent for.

One of the effects of these changes was to create spaces within the royal palaces that were genuinely private. The King even had new treble locks fitted in the privy lodgings at Whitehall, entrusting the keys to a select few.

Some of the finest of the Mantuan paintings were destined for these ‘privy’ spaces in Whitehall Palace. Van der Doort noted in his inventory that the King himself chose the paintings to hang in his Bedchamber, and it may be assumed that he did the same throughout the Privy Lodgings. In the First Privy Room there were eleven Titians and one Correggio, listed by Van der Doort probably in the order in which they were hung, with religious and secular paintings side by side. In the Second Privy Room eight paintings attributed to Titian were hung with a ‘dark blue frame with a decorative frieze in gold’ arrived in this country. For example, Giulio Romano’s Rape of Europa had a ‘dark blue frame with a decorative frieze in gold’ in the Gonzaga 1627 inventory and a ‘Blue guided frame’ in Van der Doort’s inventory. There is evidence that the bright colours of the Mantuan painted frames, combined with gilding, had an impact on the frames being made in this country. A frame for Van Dyck’s Five Eldest Children of Charles I was made to match the blue carved and gilded frame of the Giulio Romano Mermaid Feeding her Young. The combination of blue or white with gilding would have given a rich effect in contrast to the restrained colours and dark wood of English frames. Traces of blue have been found on an English carved and gilded frame for a Van Dyck portrait dated 1635. The frames on copies of the Raphael cartoons at Knole, probably painted in the 1630s, had an off-white background beneath the black.

Between 1631 and 1636 John de Critz was paid for making or decorating picture frames, as the Mantuan acquisitions were arriving. He made elaborate frames for the Titian Emperors, perhaps because they were damaged on the journey, which were painted in ‘sadd wallnuttree cullor’, gilded and decorated with ‘Maskechades ffestons Draperies the greater & lesser Scrowles & the edges betwixt the flutes all guilt wth fine gold varnished...’ In the gallery at St James’s these frames would have complemented the ‘great large Carved frame’ described by Van der Doort around the Van Dyck Charles I and M. de StAntoine (fig. 12). The King’s Works accounts record that carvers, gilders and painters such as Zachary Taylor, Matthew Goodrich, Edward Pierce and John de Critz produced these frames for the King’s palaces, and a frame in the possession of W. Gresley perhaps has such a frame as its origin.

Carracci Agony in the Garden (Royal Collection) among a group of German and Netherlandish pictures. The Cabinet Room was filled with small and precious works of art, such as bronzes and seventy-three smaller paintings, including Mantegna’s Death of the Virgin (Prado), Raphael’s St George and the Dragon (National Gallery of Art, Washington DC; fig. 2), Giorgione’s Judith (Hermitage) and Leonardo da Vinci’s St John the Baptist (Louvre).

The frames of Tudor and Elizabethan paintings were generally quite plain and painted or stained brown or black. The fashion for carved, gilded and painted frames was developed by Charles I and the Whitehall group of collectors. The arrival of Charles I’s framed Italian paintings, particularly from Mantua, influenced the design of English frames, for which there was suddenly a great demand. In Van der Doort’s inventory the new acquisitions are recorded with wooden, wooden and gilded and ‘all over guided’ frames. Most of the Italian acquisitions were carved and gilded; some are described as ‘whited’ or blue. No Mantuan frames have survived in the Royal Collection but some of the paintings must have retained their original frames when they arrived in this country. For example, Giulio Romano’s Rape of Europa had a ‘dark blue frame with a decorative frieze in gold’ in the Gonzaga 1627 inventory and a ‘Blue guided frame’ in Van der Doort’s inventory. There is evidence that the bright colours of the Mantuan painted frames, combined with gilding, had an impact on the frames being made in this country. A frame for Van Dyck’s Five Eldest Children of Charles I was made to match the blue carved and gilded frame of the Giulio Romano Mermaid Feeding her Young. The combination of blue or white with gilding would have given a rich effect in contrast to the restrained colours and dark wood of English frames. Traces of blue have been found on an English carved and gilded frame for a Van Dyck portrait dated 1635. The frames on copies of the Raphael cartoons at Knole, probably painted in the 1630s, had an off-white background beneath the black.

Between 1631 and 1636 John de Critz was paid for making or decorating picture frames, as the Mantuan acquisitions were arriving. He made elaborate frames for the Titian Emperors, perhaps because they were damaged on the journey, which were painted in ‘sadd wallnuttree cullor’, gilded and decorated with ‘Maskechades ffestons Draperies the greater & lesser Scrowles & the edges betwixt the flutes all guilt wth fine gold varnished...’ In the gallery at St James’s these frames would have complemented the ‘great large Carved frame’ described by Van der Doort around the Van Dyck Charles I and M. de StAntoine (fig. 12). The King’s Works accounts record that carvers, gilders and painters such as Zachary Taylor, Matthew Goodrich, Edward Pierce and John de Critz produced these frames for the King’s palaces, and a frame in the possession of W. Gresley perhaps has such a frame as its origin.

Carracci Agony in the Garden (Royal Collection) among a group of German and Netherlandish pictures. The Cabinet Room was filled with small and precious works of art, such as bronzes and seventy-three smaller paintings, including Mantegna’s Death of the Virgin (Prado), Raphael’s St George and the Dragon (National Gallery of Art, Washington DC; fig. 2), Giorgione’s Judith (Hermitage) and Leonardo da Vinci’s St John the Baptist (Louvre).

The frames of Tudor and Elizabethan paintings were generally quite plain and painted or stained brown or black. The fashion for carved, gilded and painted frames was developed by Charles I and the Whitehall group of collectors. The arrival of Charles I’s framed Italian paintings, particularly from Mantua, influenced the design of English frames, for which there was suddenly a great demand. In Van der Doort’s inventory the new acquisitions are recorded with wooden, wooden and gilded and ‘all over guided’ frames. Most of the Italian acquisitions were carved and gilded; some are described as ‘whited’ or blue. No Mantuan frames have survived in the Royal Collection but some of the paintings must have retained their original frames when they arrived in this country. For example, Giulio Romano’s Rape of Europa had a ‘dark blue frame with a decorative frieze in gold’ in the Gonzaga 1627 inventory and a ‘Blue guided frame’ in Van der Doort’s inventory. There is evidence that the bright colours of the Mantuan painted frames, combined with gilding, had an impact on the frames being made in this country. A frame for Van Dyck’s Five Eldest Children of Charles I was made to match the blue carved and gilded frame of the Giulio Romano Mermaid Feeding her Young. The combination of blue or white with gilding would have given a rich effect in contrast to the restrained colours and dark wood of English frames. Traces of blue have been found on an English carved and gilded frame for a Van Dyck portrait dated 1635. The frames on copies of the Raphael cartoons at Knole, probably painted in the 1630s, had an off-white background beneath the black.
made new frames in more restrained English colours, such as ‘sadd lute’, ‘sadd timber’, ‘stone’ and ‘sadd wallnuttree’ as above, which were combined with gilding. The Italianate frames made in this country would probably have emulated the Venetian ‘Sansovino’ frame, named after the architect Jacopo Sansovino, which incorporated scrolls, volutes, cherubs’ heads and festoons, the carving partially gilt. The frames on the Titian Emperors may have taken up this style. The Renaissance-style cassetta frame with gilt scrolling foliage contrasting with black or dark blue, the earliest of which can probably be dated to the 1630s, can still be found on a few Royal Collection paintings, including Pozzoserrato’s Pleasure Garden with a Maze (no. 79). This style of frame can be found on paintings by Van Dyck and continued to be popular in England throughout the seventeenth century.

It has been argued that the sums spent by Charles I on his art collection and new buildings were modest compared with those of other aristocrats and foreign princes. He spent less on great public ceremonies than Elizabeth I or James I: James’s wedding for Princess Elizabeth cost about £100,000, more than triple the cost of the Gonzaga collection. Yet much of court life must have been perceived as culturally distinct from the rest of the nation: wealthy, cosmopolitan and exclusive. Distinguished visitors were shown the gallery at St James’s Palace. However, the new emphasis on formality and the restriction of access to the King meant that only a few would have seen the treasures of the Gonzaga collection.

Charles I’s passion for painting played an important part in a new rapprochement between the English Crown and the papacy. His marriage in 1625 to Henrietta Maria, a Catholic princess and goddaughter to Pope Urban VIII, led to gifts of paintings from the Pope’s nephew, Cardinal Francesco Barberini, no doubt in the hope that Charles might incline more favourably towards the Roman Catholic Church. In 1635 Gregorio Panzani, as papal agent, tried to gather information for Barberini about the King’s taste: he heard from the Queen that the King had a ‘good nose’ for pictures and did not care whether they ‘are old or modern, so long as they are good’. Cardinal Barberini was provided with a list of the King’s preferences among contemporary Italian artists: Pietro da Cortona, Domenichino, Lanfranco, Poussin, Reni, Ribera, Albani, Guercino and the Carracci. Panzani consulted Orazio Gentileschi, who reported that the King might prefer paintings by artists not already represented in his collection; that he liked ‘old’ pictures, presumably by dead artists, for their rarity; and that of the moderns he particularly favoured Guido Reni. When seven paintings arrived in January 1636 the King rushed to see them, calling Inigo Jones, the Earl of Holland and the Earl of Pembroke to attend him. Gregorio Panzani described the scene: ‘The very moment Jones saw the pictures, he greatly approved of them, and in order to be able to study them better threw off his coat, put on his eye-glasses, took a candle and, together with the King, began to examine them very closely.’ On 6 February Panzani returned to the event: ‘As the King had removed the names of the painters, which I had fixed to each picture, he [Jones] also boasts of having attributed almost all the pictures correctly.’

The paintings were mostly portraits and included a female portrait, then thought to be by Andrea del Sarto, but now attributed to Domenico Puligo (fig. 13). Most admired were two allegories of Diligence and Fame (Kensington Palace) ascribed to Giulio Romano. In July 1636 George Conn arrived as the new papal agent with gifts of a St Catherine by Annibale Carracci and a fine reliquary. In February 1637 he presented the King with a copy of Guido Reni’s St Michael, a gift from the Pope’s brother, and described how Charles ‘recognized at once that the St Michael was of the school of Guido Reni and at first hesitated whether it were not by his own hand, but then concluded absolutely that it was not, but praised it none the less excessively’.

In 1637 Henrietta Maria displayed religious pictures she had received from the Barberini family in the chapel at Somerset House. Baglione’s St John the Baptist Wreathing a Lamb (Royal
Fontebuoni’s *Madonna di Pistoia* (no. 95) was recorded in her bedchamber in France on her death in 1669.\(^92\) Such gifts were unlikely to go unnoticed by parliamentarians such as William Prynne, who concluded, with some justification, that ‘gifts of pictures, antique idols and suchlike trumperies’ were ‘vanities brought from Rome to seduce the King’.\(^93\)

Guido Reni’s four *Labours of Hercules* (Louvre) were already in the Royal Collection (as part of the Mantuan purchase) when, in March 1637, Henrietta Maria commissioned a ceiling painting from him for her bedroom in Greenwich. The commission was handled by Cardinal Francesco Barberini, who had also managed the negotiations for Bernini’s bust of Charles I four years earlier. He suggested Bacchus and Ariadne as an appropriate subject, although he seems to have had doubts when the work was completed, writing ‘I hesitate to send it for fear of further scandalizing these Heretics, especially since the subject of the work was chosen here in Rome’. The painting reached the Queen only after she had fled to France during the Civil War; by 1648 she was trying to sell it. It was subsequently destroyed by the widow of its new owner, the French contrôleur général des finances Michel Particelli d’Emery, for its excessive nudity. The painting is known through prints and painted copies (fig. 14) and recently two fragments of the original have been discovered in the Palazzo Corsini, Rome.\(^94\)

Charles I’s attempts to lure Italian artists to London were only moderately successful. In the 1620s Guercino refused an invitation on the grounds that he did not want to live in the English climate and work for heretics.\(^95\) By 1626 Orazio Gentileschi, who had previously worked in Paris for Henrietta Maria’s mother, Marie de’ Medici, was brought to London by the Duke of Buckingham. His style appealed more to the Queen than to the King. Henrietta Maria commissioned *Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife* (no. 105) for Greenwich and took it to Colombes after the Restoration. She also commissioned the cycle of ceiling paintings illustrating the *Allegory of Peace and the Arts* for the Great Hall at Greenwich (1638–9; now Marlborough House, London; fig. 15). Although it seems unlikely that Artemisia Gentileschi assisted her father with the *Allegory*, she, too, spent two or three years in London. She presented the King and Queen with her self-portrait (no. 106) and they owned several other paintings by her.

The King’s difficulties at home prevented him from pursuing the collections of Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi or Bartolomeo della Nave, both of which became available in 1637 (in Rome and Venice respectively) and both of which were eventually purchased by Philip IV of Spain. Later in his reign the King ceased to make bulk purchases, although he continued to commission and collect on a smaller scale. The exception was the acquisition in 1637 of a group of paintings from the
collection of a figure who plays an important part in the history of the Royal Collection – William Frizell. Between 1632 and 1635 Frizell shared with Thomas Witherings, a London mercer, the post of 'Postmaster General for Foreign Parts'. He lost his position in 1635 and the following year travelled to Italy. His name is frequently mentioned in letters written in 1636 and 1637 from the Arundels (the Earl and his son, Lord Maltravers) to their agent, William Petty. Both Petty and Frizell seem to have been active in Naples, where Petty bought a large number of Polidoro drawings for Arundel. A transaction is mentioned in a letter of 4 August 1637 from Maltravers to Petty, which may be the sale to the King: ‘I believe you may come home to see the sale of Frisells pictures, for they sticke long at his prices’. Van der Doort records that Frizell’s collection consisted of twenty-three paintings, but only mentions nineteen of them in his inventory, including the set of Polidoro da Caravaggios (no. 5) and Caravaggio’s Calling of Sts Peter and Andrew (no. 92).

William Frizell is a rare example of an agent employed by both Charles I and his son, Charles II. While in exile Charles II bought from Frizell seventy-two paintings – Italian, Netherlandish, Dutch and German – at a cost of £2,686, which were sent to England in 1662 after the Restoration. The finest works in this second Frizell purchase were the French and Netherlandish paintings, once in the collection of Rudolf II, which Frizell acquired from Queen Christina of Sweden. But there was also a fine group of Italian pictures, including two small Veroneses, David Victorious over Goliath and Judith with the Head of Holofernes (Royal Collection).98

THE COMMONWEALTH SALE

Charles I fled London on 10 January 1642, some months before the outbreak of the Civil War, leaving much of his collection. There were cases of iconoclasm during the Civil War, but surprisingly few: an altarpiece by Rubens in Somerset Chapel was thrown into the Thames in 1643; St George’s Chapel, Windsor, was damaged; paintings in St James’s Chapel were defaced.99 The dispersal of Charles I’s collection was managed with some efficiency. The House of Commons ordered an inventory to be made on 17 January 1649, a fortnight before the King’s execution, and resolved to sell the entire collection on 23 March. The Act was passed on 4 July and published on 26 July 1649; the money thus realised was to pay off the debts of the royal family and ‘for public uses of this Commonwealth’.

The ‘Commonwealth Sale’ was conducted without secrecy and with few signs of public protest. It took place at Somerset House from October 1649 to late 1651, with some items sold as late as 1653.100 The inventories of these sales were said by Oliver Millar to ‘provide the principal single source for our knowledge of the appearance of the royal houses in the early Stuart period’.101 The compilers do not seem to have had access to Van der Doort’s inventory (though Jan van Belcamp, who had succeeded Van der Doort as Keeper of the King’s Pictures, was involved) and the entries vary in quality and detail, but this is the first complete record of Charles I’s possessions. About 1,570 pictures were valued at a total of £37,000. Raphael again commanded the highest price: the ‘Madonna della Perla’ was valued at £2,000 (and his small St George and the Dragon was set at £150). The next most valuable paintings after the large Raphael were Correggio’s Allegories, valued at £1,000 each; Titian’s Emperors and the ‘Venus del Pardo’, valued at £1,200 and £500 respectively; Caravaggio’s Death of the Virgin, valued at £150; and Van Dyck’s equestrian portraits of Charles I, valued at £200 and £150. The sale was delayed while the Council selected goods to be reserved for the use of the Protector, Oliver Cromwell, and the State, amongst which were Mantegna’s Triumphs of Caesar (valued at £1,000), Raphael’s cartoons (£300) and Gentileschi’s Greenwich ceiling.

There are many familiar names among the bidders at the Commonwealth Sale: surviving members of the King’s entourage, such as Balthasar Gerbier, Nicholas and Jerome Lanier and Jacques Duart, the King’s Jeweller (who paid £170 for Caravaggio’s Death of the Virgin), and artists such as Peter Lely, John Baptist Gasparis and Remigius van Leemput. Colonel John Hutchinson spent £1,349, including £600 on the ‘Venus del Pardo’.102 The first £30,000 raised was to be paid to the Treasurer of the Navy for the use of the fleet, then to the King’s retinue. A list of those with the most pressing needs (‘Creditors, Servants, Widows and Orphans’) was drawn up and £12,800 disbursed to them. Those to whom small amounts were owed were paid in full and those owed larger amounts were partly paid in goods rather than cash. A second list was drawn up, of creditors more prepared to accept goods in lieu of payment. They grouped themselves into fourteen syndicates (called Dividends), each with a leader who chose what items to acquire and then arranged for them to be sold on, so that the proceeds could be distributed. The process meant that works of art became available to a wider public than ever before. Thomas Bagley, the King’s glazier, acquired saddles worth £2,000, twenty-two antique statues and Correggio’s Venus with Mercury and Cupid (National Gallery, London; fig. 8), valued at £800.103

Unfortunately for the future of the Royal Collection, the buyers at the Commonwealth Sale were not all English. In 1653 the Council of State gave permission for Alonso de Cárdenas, the Spanish ambassador, who had already obtained Titian’s Emperors,
Fig. 15: Orazio Gentileschi, *An Allegory of Peace and the Arts; oil on canvas (Marlborough House, London)*
to export, free of duty, twenty-four chests of pictures, hangings and household goods. As Clarendon wrote, ‘in this manner did the neighbour princes join to assist Cromwell with very great sums of money … whilst they enriched and adorned themselves with the ruins and spoils of the surviving Heir’. Substantial numbers of the best pictures passed to foreign owners: Philip IV of Spain; the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, Governor of the Spanish Netherlands (who sent David Teniers to bid); Cardinal Mazarin, who later bequeathed some paintings to Louis XIV; and the German banker Everard Jabach, who later sold on to Louis XIV. Most of these paintings can now be seen in the great museums of Europe: the Prado (those bought by Philip IV), the Louvre (in the case of Louis XIV’s acquisitions) and the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Leopold Wilhelm’s).

ENGLISH COLLECTORS OF DRAWINGS IN THE AGE OF CHARLES I

In common with most collectors of the period, Charles I seems to have had no interest in drawings. The only major group of drawings that he is known to have owned was the ‘Great Book’ of over eighty portrait drawings by Hans Holbein, which he had inherited from his elder brother, and he exchanged this early in his reign for Raphael’s St George (National Gallery of Art, Washington DC; fig. 2). Van der Doort’s list of the contents of the Cabinet Room at Whitehall includes albums containing ‘sev’l’ Accons and postures invented by Michæll Angello Bonorotto’, ‘8 little drawings of Horatio Jentellesco’, and ‘Prints beeing of severall Antiquities of statues and Roman buildings’: framed drawings included ‘a larg drawing upon vellam conteyning manie little figures beeing kinde of a part of a Citty … by Juliano the Italian’. Most of these were stated to have been given to Charles I; only an album containing ‘49 Pictures by the life don in dry Cullors of the Cheifest Nobility and famous men at that tyme in ffraunce’ was actually bought by the King, and these would have been of interest not because they were drawings, but because they were portraits. He also owned the plates of four engravings that he had commissioned after paintings in his collection, including Annibale Carracci’s Agony in the Garden and Parmigianino’s Lamentation, both engraved by Lucas Vorsterman, and Titian’s Emperor Otto, engraved by Robert Van Vorst. It is unlikely that significant holdings of drawings housed elsewhere would have escaped Van der Doort’s attention, and his inventory may be taken as a reliable record of the King’s holdings at that time.

We know of only two individuals in England during the reign of Charles I who were especially interested in drawings. Nicholas Lanier, who had acted as an agent in the purchase of the Gonzaga collection (see above), may have been both a dealer in drawings and a collector, and the small star marks (of five or eight points) stamped on many Italian drawings (such as no. 18), often accompanied by an elegant inscription attributing the drawing (fig. 16), have traditionally been associated with his ownership. It now seems that Nicholas’s uncle, Jerome Lanier, was also active as a collector or dealer, and a less common six-pointed star mark (nos. 16, 22, 24), often accompanied by the inscription ‘Jerom’, seems to be his. But the Laniers’ acquisitiveness pales beside that of the Earl of Arundel, who was at that time assembling Europe’s finest collection of drawings, which he kept in a ‘Roome for Designes’ in Somerset House. It was Arundel who acquired the album containing six hundred drawings by Leonardo da Vinci that was later to enter the Royal Collection (no. 11) and many drawings by other, mainly Italian, artists; Parmigianino was a particular favourite. On the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642, Arundel left England, apparently taking much of his collection with him to the Low Countries. He died in Padua four years later, and the immediate fate of his collection of drawings is unknown.

THE RESTORATION

On the eve of the Restoration in 1660 it was realised that the returning King would need paintings to furnish his palaces and to re-establish some of the mystique of monarchy which his father had built up with works of art. The recovery of the Royal Collection was undertaken with almost as much efficiency as its dispersal. A committee was appointed the day after the proclamation of the Restoration. Among those paintings retrieved were Bronzino’s Portrait of a Lady in Green (no. 7), the Polidoro panels (no. 5), Dosso Dossi’s Holy Family (no. 32), Correggio’s Holy Family with St Jerome (no. 34), Titian’s Lovers (no. 60), Bassano’s Adoration of the Shepherds (no. 72), Tintoretto’s Esther before Ahasuerus and The Muses (nos. 75–6) and Gentileschi’s Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife (no. 105). A significant group was reluctantly handed back by the parliamentarian Viscount Lisle, later 3rd Earl of Leicester, who had acquired 120 works of art at the Commonwealth Sale, including 61 paintings. Several paintings in this exhibition were ‘retrieved’ from Lord Lisle: Caracciolo’s Cupid Sleeping (no. 94); Bassano’s Journey of Jacob (no. 73); the six Polidoro frieze panels (no. 5) and the ‘great peece of Polydore’ (probably his Psyche Discovers Cupid, still in the Royal Collection);
Giulio Romano’s Emperors on Horseback (no. 39); Gentileschi’s Sibyl (no. 104); and Fetti’s David with the Head of Goliath (no. 100). The paintings which could not be retrieved were those which had been sold abroad.

Charles II acquired as well as retrieved. In 1660 the states of Holland and West Friesland selected twenty-four paintings and twelve antique sculptures to present to the restored King as he set off from Scheveningen. The so-called ‘Dutch Gift’ was made up predominantly of Italian sixteenth-century paintings, almost all of which were bought from the collection assembled by Jan and Gerard Reynst. It was primarily Jan Reynst who had formed the collection in Venice, shipping paintings to Amsterdam and the house he shared with his brother on the Keizersgracht. The nucleus of his collection came from the Venetian nobleman Andrea Vendramin, although the most highly prized paintings and sculptures were acquired from other sources. These were commemorated in two volumes of engravings, the Caelaturae for the paintings and the Icones for the sculptures, initiated c. 1655 and published in the latter part of the 1660s. Recorded among the prints are Belliniano’s Concert (no. 57), Lotto’s Portrait of a Bearded Man and Andrea Odoni (nos. 64, 66), Parmigianino’s Pallas Athene (no. 37), Schiavone’s Judgement of Midas (no. 74), Titian’s Jacopo Sannazaro (?) (no. 59), Titian’s Virgin and Child with Tobias and the Angel (no. 61), Veronese’s Mystic Marriage of St Catherine (no. 77) and Giulio Romano’s Margherita Paleologo (no. 38).

Charles II must have made known his preference for Italian art and his need to fill the gap left by the Commonwealth Sale. The Reynst collection was unusual in seventeenth-century Amsterdam in having such rich Italian holdings. Gerard Reynst’s widow was approached; a selection was made by the sculptor Artus Quellinus and the art dealer Gerrit Uylenburgh, and the twenty-four paintings were bought for 80,000 guilders. Dutch

Fig. 16. Francesco Vanni, A sleeping figure; red and white chalks on blue paper 18.0 × 16.9 cm (Royal Library, Windsor, 84 1242).
ambassadors reported that the gift was very favourably received and that the King singled out for praise Titian’s Virgin and Child with Tobias and the Angel from among the Italian paintings, but also admired works by Dou and Elsheimer.113

As this account suggests, Charles II shared his father’s taste: his preference was for Italian sixteenth-century painting, but he also admired the Dutch and Northern masters. He seems to have lacked Charles I’s intellectual passion for painting: he had little interest in the Renaissance and, according to Jonathan Richardson the Younger, was only dissuaded from selling them to Louis XIV (for use by the Gobelins tapestry factory) by his Treasurer, the Earl of Danby.

The inventories of Whitehall and Hampton Court Palaces drawn up c.1666–7 show an impressive display of paintings in a similar combination of portraits and religious and secular art to that devised by Charles I. His private rooms could not be so focused on Titian, and he admitted to a visitor rather sadly that the Cabinet Room was ‘not half of what his father had owned’.114

In the Long Matted Gallery at Whitehall, with Van Dyck’s Charles I, Henrietta Maria and their Two Eldest Children back in the position it had been in Charles I’s day, hung Giulio Romano’s Margherita Paleologo (no. 38); Pozzoserrato’s Pleasure Garden with a Maze (no. 79); Fetti’s David with the Head of Goliath (no. 100); many of the Fetti saints; Allori’s Judith with the Head of Holophernes (no. 93); Titian’s Jacopo Sannazaro (?)(no. 59); and Caracciolo’s Cupid Sleeping (no. 94). The Perinos (no. 2) hung in the small adjoining room. In the Second Privy Lodging Room were some of the finest Italian paintings: Schiavone’s Judgement of Midas (no. 74), Giulio Romano’s Omen of Claudius (no. 39.i) and Nero Playing while Rome Burns (no. 39.ii), and Tintoretto’s Esther (no. 75), while his Muses (no. 76) and Bassano’s Journey of Jacob (no. 73) were in the larger Third Privy Lodging Room, where portraits and northern paintings were also hung. The six Polidoro friezes hung together in the so-called Greene Chamber next to the Bedchamber, with several works by Giulio Romano and Lotto’s Andrea Odoni (no. 66), and the Artemisia Gentileschi Self-portrait (no. 106). In the Closet, much praised by Samuel Pepys who ‘could have spent three or four hours there well’, were Correggio’s Holy Family with St Jerome (no. 34), Palma Vecchio’s Virgin and Child with Sts Catherine of Alexandria and John the Baptist (no. 70) and Sibyl (no. 69), Parmigianino’s Pallas Athene (no. 37), Bronzino’s Lady in Green (then thought to be by Andrea del Sarto, no. 7), and many miniatures.

There were some seventeenth-century Italian paintings in the group bought from Frizell, but they are hard to identify.115 Sir John Finch, English resident at Florence, commissioned Carlo Dolci to paint a pair ‘religious paintings’ for Charles II’s Catholic Queen, Catherine of Braganza: a Magdalene (Royal Collection) and a David (now lost). For the King he commissioned the more courtly Saloene (no. 109). Henrietta Maria had taken several paintings to Colombes near Paris, including Gentileschi’s Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife (no. 105), Fontebuoni’s ‘Madonna di Pistoia’ (no. 95), and probably the large Francesco Francia Baptism (Royal Collection). All were retrieved when she died in 1669. Charles II was also responsible for some reframing of the collection: the finely carved and gilded Louis XIII-style frames round Lotto’s Andrea Odoni (no. 66) and Gentileschi’s Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife (no. 105) date from this campaign.

Cardinal Francesco Barberini, who like Charles had experienced some years in exile, was again in a position of influence and sending gifts to the English Crown aimed at the Catholic Duke of York, the future James II. Two large mythological paintings by Romanelli sent at the Restoration were to be seen at Hampton Court in 1681, one possibly a Bacchus and Ariadne and the other a copy by Romanelli or his studio of the Guido Reni painting of the same subject for Henrietta Maria; both are now lost apart from fragments.116 Domenichino’s St Agnes (no. 98) is first recorded in 1663, when it hung in the Bedchamber of State in the Duke of York’s apartments at St James’s Palace.117 This room was later occupied by the Catholic Duchess of York, Mary of Modena. A new generation of parliamentarians were no doubt beginning to complain of ‘vanities brought from Rome to seduce the King’.

Charles also followed his father’s lead in trying to persuade Italian artists to work in England: Guercino had refused forty-eight years earlier (see above), but his nephew, Benedetto Gennari, came to England in 1674 and worked in London for fifteen years, painting religious scenes for Catherine of Braganza and erotic mythological subjects for the King. Gennari’s paintings decorated Mary of Modena’s new chapel at St James’s Palace, and after the accession of James II in 1685 the new chapel at Whitehall Palace, consecrated in 1686. The spectacle of the ‘Popish Service’ amazed John Evelyn with its ‘world of mysteri-ous Ceremony’ and prompted him to wonder that he ‘should ever have lived to see such things in the K. of Englands palace’.118 Gennari joined the exiled Catholic court of James II which fled to Saint-Germain-en-Laye in 1689. He also painted a series of altarpieces for James II.

The greatest contribution to interior decoration of the period was made by the Neapolitan Antonio Verrio, who created illusionistic ceilings for sequences of rooms at Windsor Castle (executed 1675–c.1684; three rooms survive) and Hampton Court (executed c.1700–1702; the King’s Staircase and Queen’s Drawing Room survive).
CHARLES II’S COLLECTION OF DRAWINGS

Charles II was the first English monarch who seems to have had a genuine interest in drawings. By 1675 he had somehow reacquired the album of Holbeins exchanged by his father almost fifty years earlier.119 In 1678 ‘Carlo Stuart’ was listed among those who owned drawings by the Carracci. But there is little other contemporary testimony of Charles II’s holdings of drawings, and what we know of his collection must be inferred from physical evidence and later sources.

On 22 January 1690 Constantijn Huygens, the Dutch secretary to King William III, went to Whitehall Palace, ‘to the rooms underneath the King’s Closet, where we saw four or five books with drawings, among others Holbeins and Leonardo da Vinci’.120 This is the first reference to the Leonardo album being in the Royal Collection, and we have no record of what had happened to it since it had been in Arundel’s collection half a century before. A week later, Huygens ‘looked at some more of the King’s drawings in a chest, lying upstairs, containing many drawings with single figures by Parmigianino, and several other good ones’.121 Several other diary entries over the next few months mention the King’s drawings without stating any other artists’ names. On 1 September 1690 Huygens noted seeing ‘other books of Italian drawings, which looked as if they had been robbed, and it was said that Lely [Sir Peter Lely, the portraitist], borrowing the books from Chiffinch [William Chiffinch, Keeper of the King’s Closet], had busied himself in an enormous manner by taking out originals and putting back copies, made by his people, etc’.122 While no examples of Lely ‘fakes’ have been identified to substantiate this accusation, it does seem that his borrowing of drawings from Charles II’s collection was not exceptional – a book of memoranda of Charles Beale, husband of the painter Mary Beale, recorded that in November 1674 he ‘borrowed of Wm Chiffinch Esq. eleaven of his Majesties Italian drawings’, and that in February 1677 he ‘borrowd 6 Italian drawings out of the Kings Collection for my sons to practice by’.123

It seems certain that all the drawings mentioned by Huygens had been in the Royal Collection since the reign of Charles II, and that William and Mary had simply come into possession of them when James II fled England. The identity of some of the drawings beyond the Holbeins, Leonardos and Parmigianinos may be established from physical evidence, for many Italian Renaissance drawings now in the Collection bear marks indicating that they were in England in the seventeenth century – the star-shaped stamps and inscriptions associated with Nicholas and Jerome Lanier, found on forty drawings (including nos. 16, 18, 22 and 24); the price marks of the dealer William Gibson, found on another fifty-one (including nos. 48, 49, 51 and 87); the inscribed attributions of another neat but unidentified late-seventeenth-century hand; and the clipped top corners that seem to have been a fashionable method of shaping drawings for mounting in England at that time (fig. 17).

Not one of the ninety-one drawings with Lanier stamps or Gibson inscriptions (none has both) also bears the mark of any other collector, such as Jonathan Richardson senior or junior, Sir Joshua Reynolds, or indeed Lely, who died in 1680 and whose collection of drawings was sold at auction in 1688. By contrast, roughly half of all drawings with Lanier stars or Gibson inscriptions among the general population of old master drawings (those in the British Museum may be taken as representative) bear other marks of later ownership. It may be

Fig. 17. Michelangelo, The head of the Virgin; black chalk, 21.2 × 14.2 cm (Royal Library, Windsor, rl 12764)
inferred that most, if not all, of the Windsor drawings with seventeenth-century marks have not circulated on the art market since that time, and that they have been in the Royal Collection ever since; they thus form the oldest intact collection of drawings in England, pre-dating by several decades the collections of Chatsworth and Christ Church and the beginnings of the British Museum.

Documentation on how Charles II formed his collection is sadly lacking. The Royal Librarian B. B. Woodward stated in 1866 that the Royal Collection of drawings was really commenced (as we infer from the most satisfactory evidence) by Charles II, who, as we believe, at the instance of Sir Peter Lely, purchased at the sale of the great Lord Arundel's collection in Holland the drawings and MSS of Leonardo da Vinci, the drawings of Holbein, and a considerable number of miscellaneous drawings by Michael Angelo, Raphael, Parmigiano and their scholars and followers. Woodward was correct about Charles II’s role, but his statements about the dispersal of the Arundel collection appear to have been guesswork. Like many supporters of the royalist cause, Charles II had spent the eleven years of the Interregnum, after his father’s execution in 1649, in the Netherlands. Despite his lack of resources, Charles II may have passed some of his long years in exile putting together the beginnings of a collection, and drawings were both portable and affordable. After Arundel’s death in 1646, his widow seems gradually to have dispersed his collection from her residence in Amsterdam, and the Countess’s death in 1655 presumably gave rise to another wave of selling; drawings from Arundel’s collection could thus have been acquired by Charles II before the Restoration. Nicholas Lanier also returned to England at the Restoration, and his death in 1666 was presumably followed by the dispersal of his collection. The drawings at Windsor with a William Gibson inscription may well have been acquired by Charles II directly from Gibson. But it must be borne in mind that the majority of seventeenth-century dealers and collectors left no mark on their drawings, and the provenance of many of Charles II’s drawings is likely to remain unknown.

THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION AND THE EARLY HANOVERIANS

On the day that William of Orange and Princess Mary were offered the Crown, William discussed the paintings at Whitehall with Constantijn Huygens. Although he added little to the contents of the collection, he was much concerned with their arrangement and display. Having acquired Kensington Palace in 1689, he moved some of the best pictures to be around him. He built a new gallery and arranged a dense hang of paintings, including such impressive Italian examples as the two large Tintorettos (nos. 75 and 76) and Schiavone’s Judgement of Midas (no. 74).

As part of the rebuilding of Hampton Court, the significance of Mantegna’s Triumphs of Caesar (fig. 9) and the Raphael cartoons was recognised. The Triumphs were restored by Parry Walton and Louis Laguerre and moved from the King’s Gallery to the ‘Green Gallery’ (now called the Queen’s Gallery); the Raphael cartoons were reassembled, mounted on canvas and displayed in the King’s Gallery, as remodelled by Christopher Wren and William Talman (fig. 18). William chose small-scale Italian and Dutch paintings for his private apartments, including two Giulio Romano Emperors on Horseback (no. 39) in an arrangement which was reconstructed in the 1980s and can still be enjoyed today. The joiner and frame-maker John Norris helped to reframe and hang paintings at Hampton Court; the carved oak frame around Fetti’s David with the Head of Goliath (no. 100) is typical of the type of frame he made for Hampton Court.

The taste for Guido Reni (an artist considered ‘sublime’ by Jonathan Richardson) was at its height when George I acquired two large examples of his work, a Toilet of Venus and a Perseus and Andromeda, as part of a group of six paintings bought from a Mr Laws in 1723. He displayed them in his new Great Drawing Room (later King’s Drawing Room) at Kensington. (The paintings, now thought to be by Reni’s studio, were presented to the National Gallery by William IV.) Between 1725 and 1727 George I commissioned William Kent to remodel the King’s Gallery in Kensington Palace: the scheme involved rehanging the pictures and reframing them in carved and gilded ‘Palladian’ frames made by John Howard (active 1721–9) which related to the architectural scheme as a whole. This was the first documented use of the Palladian style for this purpose. The arrangement was recreated at Kensington in 1994 and four of the frames can be seen in this exhibition, round the two Tintorettos (nos. 75–6), the Bassano Adoration of the Shepherds (no. 72) and the Schiavone Judgement of Midas (no. 74). Domenichino’s St Agnes (no. 98) and Vasari’s Venus and Cupid (no. 9) have similar frames, dating from their...
time as part of Kent’s hang in the King’s Drawing Room at Kensington. Many of William’s chosen pictures were not reinstated, notably the two huge and pivotal Van Dycks. George II’s ‘extreme ignorance in painting’ contrasted with the appreciation of his wife, Caroline of Ansbach. Queen Caroline bought a Filippo Lauri, possibly his Rest on the Flight into Egypt (Royal Collection), from the auctioneer Mr Cock the younger, and had a Maratti Annunciation (Royal Collection) in the Queen’s Dressing Room at Kensington. Queen Caroline also acquired Vasari’s Venus and Cupid (no. 9). According to Mrs Jameson, it was brought to England in 1734, exhibited at Essex House on the Strand and was to be sold by a raffle, until the Queen made a pre-emptive purchase on behalf of the King for £1,000. In 1735, when the King returned from an absence to find that the Queen had changed the pictures, he angrily demanded that they be returned to their former positions, especially the ‘gigantic fat Venus’. By this date the appreciation of Italian painting was so established that it threatened to become a dogma. This ‘fat Venus’ seemed to call into question whether the discernment of the connoisseur was not in fact the dealer’s hype. Hogarth called it a ‘monstrous Venus at Kensington, valued at a Thousand Pounds’ and imagined a conversation between an unscrupulous dealer, called Mr Bubbleman, and an honest Englishman, who asserts ‘that Grand Venus (as you are pleased to call it) has not Beauty enough for the Character of an English Cook-Maid’.

Frederick, Prince of Wales, and George III
From an early age George II’s elder son, Frederick, Prince of Wales, admired and collected sixteenth- and seventeenth-century paintings by Italian, Flemish, Dutch and French masters.
His enthusiasm developed from learning about Charles I’s activities as a collector and connoisseur. His interest in old masters was demonstrated in 1750, when he went through paintings at Kensington, Windsor and Hampton Court with the antiquarian George Vertue and the artist George Knapton. On the maiden voyage of the new state barge, designed by Kent, the royal family went to Somerset House to see Mr Walton’s progress in cleaning and mending royal pictures. He was advised by Sir Luke Schaub and by Major-General John Guise (who bequeathed his collection to Christ Church, Oxford). Guise may have recommended the Prince to buy the Annibale Carracci Head of a Man in Profile (no. 89), which is likely to be one of the ‘two Carachis, by themselves’ seen in the collection by George Vertue in 1750. The Prince had various advisers, including his ‘Cabinet Painter’ Joseph Goupy, who was also a drawing master, copyist and agent. It was probably Goupy who painted a set of copies of Luca Giordano’s Cupid and Psyche series (see no. 110), elaborately framed by Joseph Duffour, before Frederick’s son George III acquired the originals. The Prince also bought from the sale room, where he acquired two Andrea del Sartos from the collection of the French writer Roger de Piles, and from dealers such as Mr Edwins, from whom he bought Lauri’s Jacob Fleeting Laban (Royal Collection). Cagnacci’s Jacob Peeling the Rods (no. 107) was probably a gift from Lord Malpas, later Lord Cholmondely, Master of the Horse to the Prince. Frederick’s most significant drawing acquisition – an album of drawings by Nicolas Poussin (see no. 128) – was probably a gift from the royal physician, Richard Mead. The Prince employed the antiquarian George Vertue to catalogue his collections at Carlton House, Leicester House and Kew and those works surviving from the old royal collection.
Vertue particularly admired Reni’s Cleopatra with the Asp (no. 99), then at Leicester House, ‘so beautiful strong clear & Natural. of the finest taste of that skillfullest artist Guido’. He saw paintings by Titian, Cortona, Lauri, Claude, Van Dyck and Rubens, Carlo Maratti, Guido Reni, Bassano and Garofalo. Benjamin Goodison and Paul Petit were two of the best-known framers employed to carve gilt frames for his collection. After Frederick’s premature death in 1751, Vertue wrote, ‘no Prince since King Charles the First took so much pleasure nor observations on works of art or artists – and in all probability if he had lived, been an ornament to this Country’.137

Frederick’s eldest son, the future George III, showed a similar aptitude for the fine arts. In 1755, when aged 16 (five years before he succeeded his grandfather, George II), he engaged Richard Dalton as his librarian under the eye of his mentor, the Earl of Bute. It seems that Bute was almost entirely responsible for the formation of the young George’s taste in old master drawings. Dalton’s role was apparently less to organise the Prince’s library than to act as his agent in the acquisition of works of art.138

In May 1758 Dalton set out for Italy to buy works of art for the Prince (and for Bute and Sir Richard Grosvenor). His first consignment for the Prince of Wales was dispatched from Livorno in late February 1759: ‘a fine collection of Drawings are sent to Leghorn carefully packt for HRH to the Number of near 700, one Rafaele amongst them, about 40 fine ones of Guercino and several of the Carracci & other eminent Masters.’ A second batch was sent in the summer of 1759 (assuming it was not simply the first consignment delayed), and Dalton returned to England that June. He was again in Italy in 1762–3, 1768–9 and 1774–5, though few of the drawings acquired for the King on these trips can be identified. The first of these sojourns presumably saw Dalton acquire most or all of the remainder of the 836 drawings from Guercino’s studio now at Windsor (see nos. 124–5), for in 1764 he was instrumental in inviting the printmaker Francesco Bartolozzi to England, initially to produce etchings of the King’s Guercinos. It was probably on a stay in Rome in 1769 that Dalton acquired sixty drawings by Sassoferrato (see no. 135) mentioned in an undated list of disbursements.

Richard Dalton probably acquired Guercino’s Libyan Sibyl (no. 108), as well as Gennari’s copy of Guercino’s Self-portrait (Royal Collection), in Bologna in 1763.139 In May 1766 George III reimbursed Dalton with £262 for Annibale Carracci’s Il Silenzio (no. 90), which Dalton had probably bought from the Farnese family. The painting was hung in the King’s Closet in Buckingham House. The pose must have influenced Francis Cotes’s portrait of Queen Charlotte with the Princess Royal, completed in 1767 and hung in the adjacent room, the King’s Bedchamber.

George, 3rd Earl Cowper, lived in Florence at the time and, hoping for a knighthood of the Garter, offered Raphael’s Niccolini-Cowper Virgin and Child, which features so prominently with Lord Cowper in Zoffany’s Tribuna, and a painting believed to be an early Raphael self-portrait (no. 1) to George III for £4,500 in 1780. The Niccolini-Cowper Virgin and Child was not acquired (and is now in the National Gallery of Art, Washington dc), but the portrait was given to the King and was hanging in the Queen’s Dining Room, Kensington, by 1785.

Dalton was not the only agent acting for the King, nor was he responsible for the two most spectacular acquisitions of George III’s reign: the collections of Joseph Smith and Cardinal Alessandro Albani. Joseph Smith (c.1674–1770) had lived in Venice as a merchant banker since around 1700 and had been appointed British Consul there in 1744.140 He was a friend and patron of many leading artists in the city, forming an extensive collection of their works in addition to a fine group of paintings and drawings by old masters. But Smith’s finances suffered during the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–48) and the Seven Years’ War (1756–63), and he was forced to sell his collection, including his huge library. By July George III had agreed a sum of £20,000, and the following winter Dalton travelled to Venice to oversee the packing and transport of the collection.

George III acquired about five hundred paintings from Consul Smith, of which two thirds were by Italian artists. Most of these were by Venetian eighteenth-century masters, but some important earlier Italian paintings were included. No proper inventory relating to the items in the sale survives and, though there are early nineteenth-century lists associated with the pictures in the Royal Collection acquired from Smith, arranged by school, they do not record provenances.141 The lists are not a record of what came into the collection. For example, the Italian list mentions Giovanni Bellini’s Agony in the Garden, which was sold at the Reynolds sale in 1795 and is now in the National Gallery, London.142 Giovanni Bellini’s Portrait of a Young Man (no. 56), Struzzi’s Concert (no. 103), Leandro Bassano’s Tiziano Aspetti (no. 80) and Turchi’s four organ shutters (no. 97) are all works which certainly entered the Royal Collection as part of the Consul Smith purchase.

Whereas the eighteenth-century part of the Smith collection was of extraordinary quality (although restricted, with no painting by Piazzetta or Tiepolo), the collecting of the earlier schools was more haphazard and the connoisseurship not as sound; an example of this is Fetti’s Vincenzo Avogadro (no. 101),
which was listed as by Van Dyck. The Strozzi Concert (no. 103) is framed in a Venetian ‘panel’ frame with elegant moulding of flowers and scrolling foliage alternating with panels, with which Consul Smith framed the majority of his collection. The Turchi organ doors were reframed for George III in ‘Carlo Maratti’ frames, probably to harmonise with the new interiors of Buckingham House designed by William Chambers. This Italian style of frame was named after the artist and was very fashionable in the second half of the eighteenth century.143

Smith’s modern drawings included magnificent groups by Canaletto, Sebastiano and Marco Ricci, Antonio Visentini and Anton Maria Zanetti; his old masters included an album of drawings by Giovanni Ambrogio Fignon, and seven albums of old master drawings that he had bought from the Sagredo family in the early 1750s: four volumes by Giovanni Beneditto Castiglione (see nos. 140–41) and three of miscellaneous sheets that had in turn been bought by Zaccaria Sagredo (1653–1729) from the Bonfiglioli family in Bologna in 1728, along with a number of framed drawings (including no. 120). While the contents of the three miscellaneous albums remain largely unidentified (though they probably included nos. 14 and 119), many of the framed drawings are known from an inventory of the Bonfiglioli collection in 1696, and from Jonathan Richardson’s description of his visit to the Bonfiglioli palace in 1719.144

George III’s other great purchase of drawings was that of the collection of Cardinal Alessandro Albani (1692–1779). The negotiations were conducted by James Adam, younger brother of Robert Adam, who was appointed Architect of the King’s Works in November 1761 and who had come to know the Albani collection while studying in Rome between 1755 and 1757. Negotiations were conducted in secret – even Albani’s librarian, Johann Joachim Winckelmann, was kept in the dark – and in May 1762, James Adam received authorisation from London to proceed with the purchase for the asking price of 14,000 scudi (£3,500).145 The collection, ‘containing betwixt drawings and prints, 200 volumes in folio’, was transported to Livorno, from where it was finally shipped to London together with the Smith collection, arriving in July 1763.

As a young man Albani had acquired a huge number of drawings from his uncle, Pope Clement XI, including the collections of Carlo Maratti (nos. 149–50) and Cassiano dal Pozzo (nos. 129–30). But no inventory of the Albani collection survives, and while we can state that some groups of drawings come from that source with certainty, and others with reasonable confidence (such as those by Lanfranco and Sacchi, nos. 131–2), we have no firm evidence for the acquisition of several other important groups of seventeenth-century Roman drawings, such as those by Maratti (rather than from his collection) and Bernini (nos. 136–7).

A number of albums from the Smith and Albani collections remain intact, but many of the drawings that George III purchased or inherited were remounted with characteristic wash borders by the King’s bindery, rearranged by artist and school, and placed within new albums, thus obliterating much physical evidence of their earlier provenance. The arrangement of the collection towards the end of George III’s reign was recorded in the so-called ‘Inventory A’, the earliest detailed inventory of the Royal Collection of drawings, compiled (partly from earlier lists) around 1810 and describing, in varying degrees of detail, the contents of the many albums of drawings that were then kept in the Library of Buckingham House.

George III had a practical attitude to collecting, without the zeal of his father or son, so that in 1770 he wrote, having declined to try to buy a supreme royal portrait by Van Dyck: ‘I have, at least for the present, given up collecting pictures’. One of his main reasons for buying paintings was to furnish Buckingham House, acquired in 1762 as a dower house for the Queen and transformed by William Chambers. The King’s suite of rooms was on the ground floor, that of the Queen on the first floor. The King worked on a careful hang of paintings for Buckingham House: he drew up some sheets of the plans himself in about 1774, and amended them.146 New acquisitions were combined with inherited and contemporary paintings. The King’s Closet was densely hung with sixteenth-century Italian paintings, including Parmigianino’s Portrait of a Young Nobleman (no. 36), two Titians, two school of Raphael, Garofalo’s Holy Family (no. 33) and later the Correggio St Catherine Reading (no. 35), complementing the seventeenth-century works, which included Carlo Dolci’s Mary Magdalene (Royal Collection), Guercino’s Libyan Sibyl (no. 108), Reni’s Cleopatra with the Asp (no. 99) and Annibale Carracci’s Il Silenzio (no. 90). The Turchi organ doors were part of a hang of twenty Venetian pictures in the King’s Library. The Luca Giordano Cupid and Psyche series (no. 110) was incorporated into a revised hang in the King’s Bedchamber, with Lauri’s Journey’s of Jacob (Royal Collection) and pastels by Liotard. Upstairs the Raphael cartoons were brought from Hampton Court and hung in the Great Room (or Grand Saloon).147 In the Drawing Room the large Renis bought by George I were combined with Veronese’s Mystic Marriage of St Catherine (no. 72) and Domenichino’s St Agnes (no. 98), with a Titian copy and a Ribera as overdoors. In the Second Drawing Room (or Warm Room) Cagnacci’s Jacob Peeling the Ribs (no. 107) and paintings by Maratti, Guercino and Reni were hung with works by Andrea del Sarto and Van Dyck.

38 THE ART OF ITALY
In spite of his importance as a collector in almost every other area, George IV made a negligible contribution to the Italian holdings of the Royal Collection. When in 1823 he donated his father’s library to the British Museum, the albums of drawings were clearly seen as distinct from the collection of books and were retained, though the King had little personal interest in old master drawings. At the end of his life, when his health was failing, George IV passed up the opportunity to purchase the collection of Sir Thomas Lawrence, one of the greatest collections of old master drawings ever formed by an individual. Lawrence died in January 1830, deeply in debt due to his passion for collecting and, as stipulated in his will, George IV was given first refusal of the entire collection for £18,000, well below the market price. Had he been able to accept, the Royal Collection would now hold the world’s greatest group of drawings by Michelangelo and Raphael alongside those by Leonardo.

VICTORIA AND ALBERT

Prince Albert was the only royal collector to have travelled in Italy.148 His visit as a young man in 1838–9 awakened his love of early (fourteenth- and fifteenth-century) Florentine painting. In Rome he met his future artistic adviser, Ludwig Grüner, and possibly some painters from the group called the ‘Nazarenes’.149 After his marriage to Queen Victoria in 1840 he concerned himself with the care of the paintings, particularly at Hampton Court, and commissioned Richard Redgrave’s descriptive inventory of the entire Royal Collection. The royal couple’s acquisition of early Italian, German and Netherlandish pictures (many bought as presents for each other) make up the last significant addition to the old master holdings of the Royal Collection. All but a handful date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, bought at a time when such works were still regarded as ‘primitive’. The only Victorian acquisition in this catalogue is Romanino’s Portrait of a Man (no. 63), bought from Nicholls in May 1846 as a Giorgione and hung (with much of the early Italian collection) in the Dressing Room and Writing Room at Osborne House (itself inspired by Italian Renaissance architecture; fig. 19). Two years earlier Prince Albert had bought Catena’s Salome (Royal Collection) as by Luini from Nicholls. A set of eight frescoes by Lattanzio Gambara, Romanino’s assistant and collaborator, now at Holyroodhouse, was purchased in 1856 ‘as specimens of fresco painting’ to assist in the decoration of the Garden Pavilion at Buckingham Palace and in the new Houses of Parliament. In 1851 Prince Albert acquired a collection of early Italian, German and Netherlandish pictures belonging to his cousin, Prince Louis (Ludwig) of Oettingen-Wallerstein, as security for a loan of £3,000 which was never repaid. Queen Victoria gave the best of this group to the National Gallery, London, in 1863, after the Prince Consort’s death.

The Renaissance and Baroque Italian paintings that we see today in the Royal Collection are in effect the legacy of the Stuarts. Many of the greatest paintings collected by Charles I could not be reclaimed by his son, but some major works were retrieved. More crucially, the memory of what was once in the collection and an awareness of the importance of Italian art for Charles I were inherited by his successors. Subsequent royal collectors, such as Frederick, Prince of Wales, consciously tried to match Charles I’s example.

The way in which Italian art is represented in the Royal Collection has been determined by personal taste, as well as a desire to keep up to date with contemporary Italian art, either by collecting or encouraging Italian artists to work in this country. Paintings were displayed both to make a public show of magnificence and for more private enjoyment. In the seventeenth century Italian art served as ‘a piece of State’, part of grand plans for galleries or as pawns in political manoeuvres. It also provided a cabinet for kings. It was for his private rooms at Osborne House that Prince Albert collected small, refined ‘gold backs’, while the collections at Hampton Court and Windsor Castle could now be viewed by the general public. Today Italian art in the Royal Collection is displayed in all its diverse locations, much of it available to be enjoyed and studied by visitors, and temporarily brought together and concentrated in these pages.
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FLORENCE AND ROME SIXTEENTH CENTURY
Follower of Raphael (Raffaello Santi)
Urbino 1483–Rome 1520

1. Portrait of a Man c.1506–13

Oil on panel
42.8 × 41.9 cm
RCIN 405760

Provenance
Presented to George III by the 3rd Earl Cowper, in 1781, as a self-portrait by Raphael

Reference
Shearman 1983, no. 217; Meyer zur Capellen 2001, X-16

After an early training in Urbino with his father, Giovanni Santi, the precocious Raphael worked in the circles of Perugino and Pinturicchio in Tuscany, Umbria and the Marche before basing himself around 1504 in Florence, where he created some of his finest portraits. He was called to Rome by Pope Julius II in 1508 and was soon the leading painter at the Papal court. Raphael’s inventive style developed rapidly, and in the decade before his early death he dominated the artistic scene in Rome, frequently working on several simultaneous projects which he controlled through assistants including Giulio Romano, Perino del Vaga and Polidoro da Caravaggio (see nos. 4, 5, 16, 17, 38–40).

This painting has had a mixed critical fortune. Passavant accepted it as a Raphael and probably influenced Prince Albert’s decision to have it cleaned by Seguier in 1856. In his notebook, begun in 1854, Cavalcaselle accepted it, but published it as the work of one of Raphael’s Florentine disciples. More recently Volpe, Camesasca, Becherucci and Shearman have accepted it as a self-portrait, painted around 1505–6 in Urbino. Others have rejected this attribution, without agreeing whether the artist comes from Umbria, Tuscany, Emilia or Romagna.1 Two questions remain open: is this of Raphael and is it by Raphael?

If the roughly 20-year-old sitter is meant for Raphael, then the painting must date from between the (possibly self-) portrait drawing of c.1500–1502 (Ashmolean) and the Self-portrait of c.1506 (Uffizi; fig. 20), in which Raphael already had the thinner face of the self-portrait in the School of Athens of c.1509–10. The young man here has more bulbous eyes and nose and fuller lips than images of Raphael at any age.

The inscriptions on the eyelets of the cloak read RAPAELO and VRBINVS (followed by three or four indecipherable letters or digits). These letters may have been reinforced at a later date, but otherwise seem to be original. It is not clear if this inscription refers to the artist or sitter. Another portrait of a man, by a follower of Raphael (Alte Pinakothek, Munich; fig. 21) also has a signed eyelet, reading RAPAELO VBIN.S.P. and shows a similar-looking sitter, although it appears to be by a different artist and of lesser quality.2

The top edge of the Royal Collection painting is original and has an exposed strip of white ground but the other three sides have been cut.3 It is likely that originally the sitter’s hands were included and he may have been framed by two columns, perhaps of red marble as in the Munich portrait and the circle or follower of Raphael portrait of a young man in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles.4

All three portraits (Munich, Getty and Royal Collection), which seem to be by different artists, have been associated with Raphael’s St George and the Dragon (National Gallery of Art, Washington dc, fig. 2), presumably painted for Guidobaldo, Duke of Urbino, in c.1506. The landscape in St George and these three portraits betray the influence of a diptych by the Netherlandish artist Hans Memling, now divided between the Alte Pinakothek, Munich (St John) and the National Gallery of Art, Washington dc (St Veronica), which appears to have been brought to Urbino from Venice by Pietro Bembo in 1505 or 1506. The landscape in the Munich portrait copies a part of the Memling St John precisely. In the Royal Collection portrait the stag, fortified towers and minutely rendered foliage can be traced back to Memling’s work.

The two vistas of landscape on either side of the sitter in this portrait are slightly different from each other. This is not unprecedented in Raphael’s work: the background of the Small Cowper Madonna (National Gallery of Art, Washington dc) of c.1505 shows a similar, but less marked, dislocation. In the Royal Collection painting the same pigments occur in both areas of landscape, but they seem to come from different periods in the artist’s work.5 The right-hand side belongs with the works of c.1505 already mentioned, but the passage
on the left is more loosely painted, with a
distinctive cool blue-green found in paintings
by Raphael after he had moved to Rome:
The Virgin and Child with the Infant Baptist (The
Garvagh Madonna; National Gallery, London;
c. 1509–10), The Virgin and Child with St John
(The Alba Madonna; National Gallery of Art, Washington dc; c. 1509–11). The hot pink
tones in the young man’s face and the painterly
treatment of his shirt also relate to paintings
of this date, such as the Portrait of Pope Julius II
(National Gallery, London; 1511) and Portrait of
a Lady (‘La Donna Velata’; Pitti Palace, Florence;
1512–13).

The crude single-line underdrawing for the
figure (fig. 22), some of it visible to the naked
eye, is unlike Raphael’s usual drawing style
and very different from the searching under-
drawing in the Uffizi Self-portrait of c. 1506
(fig. 20): it has the mechanical quality of
someone following a tracing. The artist of
the Royal Collection painting clearly knew
Raphael’s work well, as can be seen not only
in the landscape, but also in details such as the
way the eyebrows are painted, and the neckline
and folds of the shirt. At the same time he was
not a mere copyist: adjustments have been
made to the composition, most notably the
extension of the shirt over the grey (now
showing black) on his left shoulder. The portrait
may be a pastiche of Raphael, perhaps painted
shortly after his death in 1520, when there
must have been great demand for works by the
master (and likenesses of him). It may, on the
other hand, be a copy of a lost original portrait
dating from c. 1507 of a man by Raphael. It
seems to have been painted by an accomplished
artist with intimate knowledge of Raphael’s
early work who brings his sources together
to create a powerful and intriguing whole.

1 Shearman 1983, pp. 208–9; Sonnenburg 1983, p. 113;
Woods-Marsden 1996, pp. 111ff; Meyer zur Capellen
2001, x–16, pp. 315–16.
2 Sonnenburg 1983, pp. 106–8. The combination
of Italian and Latin cannot be found in Raphael’s
own work.
3 The portrait was cleaned and conserved by the
Hamilton Kerr Institute, 1978.
4 Jaffé (D.) 1997, p. 102; Meyer zur Capellen 2001,
pp. 316–17.
5 Analysis with the microscope shows that the blue-
green so evident on the left also defines trees and
the distant landscape on the right.
6 For the Uffizi portrait’s infra-red reflectogram see
Meyer zur Capellen 2001, p. 259; London 2004,
pp. 70–71. There is no underdrawing in the landscape.
The rather formulaic drawing in the face consists of
short overlapping lines rather than a smooth continuous
contour, which may suggest that it was traced in some
way rather than executed freehand. The fainter lines
on the nose might be the remains of the first traced
image, which was then reinforced. The author is
grateful to Rachel Billinge, National Gallery, for
her assistance with infra-red reflectography and to
Carol Piazzotta, Jill Dunkerton, Paul Joannides, Jane
Bridgeman, Jon Seydl, Cornelia Syre, Herbert Lank
and Patrick Matthiesen for their advice.

Fig. 22 Infra-red reflectogram of no. 1
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himself. There are alternative versions of his Sacrifice of Isaac and Assumption of the Virgin, both important commissions. Ideas were first worked out on paper, resulting in a full-scale drawn design or cartoon that could be used to transfer the image on to the surface of the painting and replicate the design, a process described by Vasari. The design could then be adjusted and improved with further studies and with underdrawing on the surface of the painting, so that each version is unique and subject to Sarto’s artistic control. In the case of the Royal Collection painting there is a large amount of exploratory work in the underdrawing on the panel, clearly visible in infra-red reflectography (fig. 24), probably executed freehand with a brush with great confidence and fluidity. This is very different from the mechanical lines which would result from transferring a cartoon. In the underdrawing the folds of Christ’s tunic radiate in the opposite direction to the eventual folds. He seems to have been seated cross-legged, his leg then extended out in paint. His right arm was closer to the Virgin’s arm, with his right hand resting on his knee rather than, as now, tucked behind his leg. Many areas were then altered when it came to painting.

The order of the four versions and the relationship between them is not clear, although the Royal Collection painting seems to have been the starting point. Recent conservation shows that while the Virgin’s face and headdress were resolved, other areas, particularly the lower part of the painting, were left sketchy, probably unfinished. Narrow strips of wood expand the composition very slightly on both sides and at the top. A red chalk study in the Ashmolean Museum (fig. 25), showing the Christ Child in a tunic, seated on a cushion and with his leg extended, must have been executed after the Royal Collection painting. This drawing seems to have formed the basis for other versions of the Christ Child, particularly that at Alnwick, which appears to follow the Royal Collection painting and the drawing. Unlike the other versions, the Botti Madonna is
slightly smaller (about 10 per cent), meaning that the cartoon would have had to be scaled down. It is painted with more opaque lead whites and has a sketchy and abbreviated character compared with areas of sculptural density in the Royal Collection version. Both have the extraordinary effect of unfinish characteristic of late Sarto, seen especially in the Christ Child’s hair.

This design can be dated by comparison with the Virgin and Child (Pitti Palace, Florence) of c.1528–30 and the Holy Family (Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica, Rome) of c.1528–9. The backgrounds of the Royal Collection painting and the Botti Madonna are both a subtle green, like that recently revealed behind the Portrait of a Woman Holding a Volume of Petrarch (Uffizi) of c.1528.

The Alnwick version, 57.8 × 41.1 cm. The Allen Memorial Art Museum version formerly Baring and Northbrook collections (Christie’s, 11 June 1937, no. 18), 60.9 × 45.7 cm; John Shearman (London 2001a, p. 21, note 20) noted that it had underdrawing, was a good workshop product but was in a poor state and had been transferred to glass support. There is also a version in the E. Johnson-Stampe collection, Stockholm, canvas 53 × 40 cm. Freedberg (1963, ii, p. 225) lists a version in Jacksonville Art Museum, Florida, transferred to glass support, 65 × 45 cm. See also Cheney 1970, pp. 32–40, p. 33, note 8.

The strips measure 2.4 cm across at the top, 1.7 cm on the left, 1 cm on the right. These are apparently the remnants of more substantial non-original additions, attached prior to 1836; the enlarged size (25 ½ × 21 in or 64.8 × 53.3 cm) is recorded by Redgrave on 18 October 1862. The panel was cut down to its present size in 1867 by Pinti, who probably left these thin strips on three sides to compensate for the fact that the panel appears to have been reduced slightly from its original dimensions before any additions were attached. The size of the extant original surface is 54.1 × 39.9 cm.

Parker 1938–80, ii, no. 681, as by Francesco Salviati.

The cushion on the ledge and Christ’s neat tunic in the drawing are found in the Botti Madonna and Alnwick versions, but the latter replicates the little tie on the tunic.

London 2001a, p. 38.

Natali and Cecchi 1989, nos. 61 and 60.
3. **Portrait of a Woman in Yellow c.1529–30**

Oil on poplar panel  
64.3 × 50.1 cm  
**RCIN 404427**

**Provenance**  
First certainly recorded at Windsor in the 1830s and bears a William IV brand

**References**  
Shearman 1983, no. 3; Natali and Cecchi 1989, no. 71

This portrait of an unknown woman is unfinished and dates from the very end of Sarto’s life; it is possible that his death from the plague prevented its completion. It provides a fascinating insight into a work-in-progress in a Renaissance studio. The most finished area is the face with skin tones of a polished solidity, which contrasts with the spontaneity of the sitter’s vibrant yellow dress. This is broadly indicated with the pale thin *imprimatura* still exposed in the area of the sleeve. For the forehead the first paint layer appears to have been sketchily and thinly applied, not as a flat tone but using a ‘wet-in-wet’ range of shadow and highlight. The left side of the face and neck was then worked up more fully with opaque flesh tones. The lower layers of her shirt and dress and the background were freely executed with a relatively broad brush. Sarto then indicated her sleeves and waistband with ochreous brushstrokes, even adjusting areas with his palm and fingers. The background is modulated from a warm dark red to brown and may have eventually changed tone to indicate her shadow, as in the background of the *Portrait of Beccuccio Bicchieraio* (National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh) of c. 1528. The sitter was to have worn a green headdress, but it is simply sketched in and therefore hard to know whether leather or cloth was intended. The accomplished underdrawing is free and bold. Some lines are visible on the surface, for example the long, sweeping strokes giving the turn of her neck; other areas can be seen with infra-red reflectography. The construction of the features and smaller details (the strands of hair, the ornament on her headdress) were drawn in and then adjusted in the process of painting, often leading to small changes in position. It is likely that the artist was working from a detailed drawing, made from the life, such as the red chalk drawing (Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Paris) for the *Woman Holding a Volume of Petrarch* (Uffizi) of c.1528.

This work is more fully realised and powerful than the similarly unfinished portrait (Staatliche Museen, Berlin) of c.1522, for which there is a detailed preparatory drawing (Uffizi). The sculptural relief of her skin tones and angular drapery have been compared to similarly unfinished passages of the same date: the head of Isaac in *The Sacrifice of Isaac* (Cleveland Museum of Art, Ohio) of c.1528–9; the figure of St Agnes in the Pisa polyptych (Duomo, Pisa) of c.1528; and the unfinished head of San Fedele in the Poppi altarpiece (Pitti Palace, Florence). The composition here is balanced and simple, without the distraction of hands, attributes or background. Characteristic of Sarto’s late work is the way in which the sitter emerges from the dark background, her features caught in intense light and flickering shadows. She fixes us with a heavy-lidded gaze, suggestive of melancholy and world-weariness.

In fact her expression is enigmatic, but the concentration of her gaze is made more powerful by the contrast of her unyielding skin tones with the unfinished dress. The bravura of the brushwork here gives the portrait its immediacy since it gives the illusion that the artist has only stopped work to which he will return.

---

2 Cleaned by Haines 1901, Brealey 1955 and Adelaide Izat 2006. The poplar support has an original tapered dovetailed baton on the verso, which is nearer the lower edge of the painting than the top. Damage to the edges of the painting make it impossible to know if this is evidence that the panel has been reduced in size.
4 Natali and Cecchi 1989, no. 38; Florence 1986a, no. 52 for Uffizi drawing note 6478.
5 Freedberg (1965) dates it slightly earlier, to 1527–8; Shearman (1965) dates it c.1528–30 and likens it to the late St Sebastian, known by copies. Natali and Cecchi (1989) place it closer to 1530 and compare it to the Poppi altarpiece.
PERINO DEL VAGA (PIETRO BUONACCORSI)
Florence 1501–Rome 1547

4. Fragments of a Deposition of Christ c.1520–25

i. The Good Thief (St Dismas)
Oil on panel
122.6 × 84.6 cm
RCIN 402869

ii. The Bad Thief (Gestas)
Oil on panel
123.4 × 83.5 cm
RCIN 402868

Provenance
Painted for an altar in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome; possibly Palazzo Zuccaro, Rome, c.1600; listed in Nicholas Lanier’s export permits from Rome, 29 January 1626; acquired on behalf of Charles I; valued at £40 the pair and sold to Stone and associates on 23 October 1651; recovered at the Restoration

References
Shearman 1983, nos. 192 and 193; Parma 2001, no. 31

Perino trained in his native city of Florence, first with Andrea de’ Ceri and then Ridolfo Ghirlandaio. Around 1516 he accompanied an obscure painter named Vaga (from whom Perino took his name) to Tuscania and then to Rome. He worked for a time under Raphael, and during the 1520s emerged as one of the city’s leading painters. After the Sack of Rome in 1527 Perino moved to Genoa, spending a decade in the service of Andrea Doria. On his return to Rome he became principal painter to Pope Paul III, supervising decorative schemes in the Sala Regia and Castel Sant’Angelo, along with many minor projects. According to Vasari, he died of overwork.

One of Perino’s first commissions in Rome was for an altarpiece of the Deposition of Christ for the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. The altarpiece, of which these are the only surviving fragments, was vividly described by Vasari in his life of the artist:

the figures that he painted most divinely were those of the two Thieves, left fixed upon the crosses, which, besides appearing to be real dead bodies, reveal a very good mastery over muscles and nerves, which this occasion enabled him to display; wherefore, to the eyes of him who beholds them, their limbs present themselves all drawn in that violent death by the nerves, and the muscles by the nails and cords. There is, in addition, a landscape wrapped in darkness, counterfeited with much judgement and art. And if the inundation which came upon Rome after the sack [in October 1530] had not done damage to this work, covering more than half of it, its excellence would be clearly seen; but the water so softened the gesso, and caused the wood to swell in such sort, that all the lower part that was soaked has peeled off too much for the picture to give any pleasure; nay, it is a grief and a truly heartrending sorrow to behold it, for it would certainly have been one of the most prestigious things in all Rome.3

Something of the original appearance of this destroyed altarpiece can be reconstructed from surviving drawings: a red chalk study of the group at the foot of the Cross (British Museum; fig. 26) and a squared-up version (Louvre) and a pen and ink copy (Prentenkabinet der Rijks-universiteit, Leiden) of the same area, as well as studies for individual figures.2 It is easy to see how these two fragments would have fitted together, with Christ’s cross between them, hung with drapery, and grieving apostles below – St Peter and John the Evangelist can still be seen below the Bad Thief.3

It has recently been suggested that the altarpiece was painted to decorate the chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, commissioned by Giovanni Battista Branconio dell’Aquila (who died in 1522) to house the remains of his brother, Benedetto, and demolished when the choir was remodelled in c.1536–40.4

Fig. 26 Perino del Vaga, The Descent from the Cross; red chalk, 32 ½ × 27 cm (British Museum, London)

Fig. 27 Pietro Francesco Alberti, Academia di Pittori; etching, 41 ½ × 52.7 cm (British Museum, London)
original position (above the altar of a chapel on the left-hand side of the choir) the direction of the light within the painting would have been consistent with that of the church, and the orientation of the body of Christ would have related to the high altar of the church. 7 Vasari describes the painting as damaged but not dismembered; he could have seen it just after the flood when he visited Rome in 1531–2. It was probably housed somewhere in the church for most of the century, as it seems to have influenced several prints of the Deposition dating from the 1540s to 1570s.8 It must have been dismembered by 1600, when one of the two fragments appears on the wall of an academy for artists in an etching by Pietro Francesco Alberti (1584–1638; fig. 27).9 After these fragments were cut out, a piece of wood (cut from elsewhere in the altarpiece) was inserted at the bottom right of the Good Thief to disguise a large area of original paint loss and then strips of wood were added on all four sides. These additions and the backgrounds of both panels were repainted at this time in order to rationalise the compositions. Shearman has suggested that the Academy, which appears in Alberti’s engraving, was the one provided by Federico Zuccaro in his house at Trinità dei Monti, in which case these panels might be the ‘Doi crucifissi spiranti ritoccati dal Sr Federico, poco pio alti de quadri da testa’ mentioned in his 1609 inventory and their rescue and repainting attributable to him.8

Recent infra-red examination has shown very different underdrawing for parts of the paintings. The head of St Peter has dots clearly made through a pricked cartoon, perhaps in ink rather than the more usual charcoal dust (see fig. 29).9 There is no underdrawing visible for the figure of St John. The Bad Thief has delicate underdrawing, probably in black chalk with some pentiments between drawing and painting. In contrast, the Good Thief has stronger lines, again probably in black chalk, resembling the rhythmic pen and ink contours of Perino’s drawings (see fig. 28). Progress on the painting can be divided up into phases, with different underdrawing for each, reinforcing the idea that Perino started the painting in 1520–21, before he left Rome for Florence. The drawing in the British Museum would record this phase of the painting. X-radiography and infra-red reflectography reveal a second stage, with a different landscape background, while the thieves were added in a third stage after the artist’s return to Rome, probably in 1523–5. Wolk has suggested that the death of the patron in 1522 may have prompted the addition of the two thieves (otherwise rare in paintings of this date), the Good Thief providing a moving example of salvation through faith.10

At this early stage in his career Perino was looking at and combining diverse sources. The stretched pose of the Bad Thief has been compared to the antique sculpture of Marsyas (Uffizi), also hung on a tree-like cross.11 The thieves have been likened to Sebastiano del Piombo’s Deposition (Hermitage, St Petersburgh) of 1516, which features a dark sky against which the crosses are silhouetted and figures dramatically lit with a silvery light.12 The bodies here show an attention to anatomical detail, a vigorous energy and an elongated elegance which owes much to Michelangelo.13 The fragments show Perino’s combination of the two very different and competing schools in Rome: the energy and elegance of Raphael and Peruzzi and the expressive and muscular grandeur of Michelangelo and Sebastiano del Piombo. The scenes have a powerful and emotional sharpness in their stark illumination that in Perino’s later work is modified to a more ornamental, stylised grace.

2 British Museum, 1854-6-28-13; Louvre inv. 5008; Leiden inv. 196854; Popham 1945, p. 63; Pouncey and Gere 1962, p. 92, no. 157; Davidson 1963, pp. 8–9; Gere 1987, no. 69; Van der Sman 1999, p. 166. Wolk suggests that the British Museum work was a presentation drawing to gain approval from the patron, while the squared-up Louvre piece was the artist’s working drawing (1990, p. 235, note 3). Van der Sman suggests the Louvre drawing may be a copy of a working modello. The study of the leg of the Good Thief has also been attributed to Rosso, and more recently to Saliotti by Monbeig Goguel (2000, p. 140).
3 Van der Sman (1999) identifies the figure of St Peter as that of St Paul.
4 Wolk 1990, p. 233 and note 5.
7 Academia di Pittori (British Museum); Bartsch (1803–21, vii, 53, 1. The connection first noticed by Philip Pouncey (undated letter in the Royal Collection picture files).
13 Popham 1945, p. 63; see also Parma 2001, p. 131.
14 See Freedberg (1990, p. 691, note 52) for a comparison with Michelangelo drawings. Wolk suggests that the Good Thief may derive from Bertoldo’s Crucifixion ( Bargello) and Donareto’s Deposition on the pulpit in San Lorenzo, Florence.
4.1 The Good Thief
5. Panels from the decoration of a palace interior c.1527–8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. Psycho Exposed on a Rock</th>
<th>ii. Putti with Swans</th>
<th>iii. Putti Pulling in a Net</th>
<th>iv. Putti with Mallets and Balls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil on pine panel</td>
<td>Oil on pine panel</td>
<td>Oil on pine panel</td>
<td>Oil on pine panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.7 × 161.5 cm</td>
<td>30.2 × 141.9 cm</td>
<td>29.8 × 141.0 cm</td>
<td>30.3 × 150.3 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rcin 402919</td>
<td>rcin 402873</td>
<td>rcin 402875</td>
<td>rcin 402874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROVENANCE**

Acquired by Charles I in 1637 from ‘Fressley’ or ‘ffrezley’, probably William Frizell. (i) valued at £40 in 1649 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to Jerome Lanier; recovered at the Restoration; (ii–vii) valued at £120 by the Trustees for Sale and sold on 17 May (or 19 May) 1650 to John Hadnott; recovered at the Restoration from Lord Lisle, 8 September 1660 (Penhurst ms.1160, fol. 14). Redgrave and Law record a Charles I brand on (i) before restoration in 1947; (ii–vii) all have Charles I’s brand on the back. All but (i) have labels on the back; that on (vii) is not entirely legible, the others read: “John the 4th/1657/ was bought by the King of Mr Freiseley a Collection of 23 Italian pictures of which this is /N10 [or 11–14] / Done by Polidore”.

**REFERENCES**


Polidoro Caldara, called Polidoro da Caravaggio after his birthplace, joined Raphael’s workshop in about 1517 and collaborated on the Vatican Loggie. In his lifetime Polidoro was best known for his large-scale monochrome frescoes painted on the outsides of Roman palaces, which have almost all disappeared. After the Sack of Rome in 1527 he moved to Naples and then Sicily, remaining in southern Italy for the rest of his life.

These seven panels are part of a series of nine, made up of three large scenes from the story of Cupid and Psyche and six narrow ornamental friezes; they are first recorded when acquired in 1637 by Charles I (see Provenance). Two of the larger panels are not exhibited here: Psyche Discovers Cupid (Royal Collection; fig. 30) and the Reception of Psyche into Olympus (Louvre; fig. 11), which was not recovered at the Restoration in 1660. There is no documentation of the original commission and no way of telling if the set of nine is complete, although the three Psyche scenes make what could be a stand-alone group of highlights from the story.

The story of Cupid and Psyche comes from Chapter vii of Apuleius’s *Golden Ass* and is summarised below in the discussion of Luca Giordano’s more extensive treatment (see no. 110). The episode illustrated in no. 5.i is the same as the third in that series (no. 110.iii): Polidoro shows Psyche abandoned on a rock in the sea rather than on a mountain; her parents, the King and Queen, are being rowed back to the shore. Above, Psyche is being wafted away by the West Wind or Zephyr. Panel 5.ii shows a swan-hunt: some putti try to catch swans in nets, others struggle with them, and one holds a swan next to a cage under what appears to be a decoy. Another putto is dressing himself. In no. 5.iii putti ride dolphins, sail shells and pull in nets; on the left one coils the line of a net, while another stands behind him next to a basket of fish, resting an arm on a wine container and directing operations. In no. 5.iv two putti pour water from a well into a large container, a group of three play with mallets and balls, and on the left, one carries a book, and one rides on the back of another towards a fourth, who seems to sit in judgement. Panel 5.v shows a satyr uncovering a nymph, lying in front of a makeshift tent and protecting a child. In the centre a putto breaks a branch from a tree; to the right the same putto (or his companion) beats a satyr, watched by an owl. A similar group appears in no. 5.vi: on the left, next to a herm under a tree, a putto feeds a she-goat while another pipe; to the right of the fighting goats a putto leads a ram while another, wearing a hooded cape, sits on a sack. Finally, in panel 5.vii two women pull a boat containing a woman and two satyrs, one blowing a horn.

These panels are obviously decorative and were probably painted in situ for an item of furniture or the panelling of a room. They are thick (averaging 2.8 cm, with the exception of 5.ii, which has been thinned and cradled) and robust enough to build into a larger structure. The frieze panels are of standard height, though varying length: one pair is 150 cm long (nos. 5.iv and vii), one 141 cm long (nos. 5.ii and iii) and one 120 cm long (nos. 5.v and vii). The large panels are of standard width (roughly 160cm) and varying height: no. 5.i is 85.7 cm high (and has a barbe, so must preserve its original dimension); the Royal Collection *Psyché Discovers Cupid* (fig. 30) is 157.8 cm high (not including a narrow modern addition); and the Louvre panel (fig. 31) is 104.5 cm high (although Van der Doort records its height at the equivalent of 117 cm, so it may have been cut down).

Shearman discussed the possibility that the paintings were part of the decoration of a bed, the love story of Cupid and Psyche being an appropriate subject for a bedchamber. The difficulty comes when trying to match this set of panels with the design of contemporary beds or other types of decorated furniture. The standard bed of the day (lettiera) tended to be decorated with fine woodwork rather than painted decoration, as did its fashionable replacement, the four-poster, illustrated by Sodoma in his *Alexander Visiting Roxana* of c.1511 (Villa Farnesina, Rome). The use of pine for these panels would probably not have been prestigious enough as a material for a bed. The chests put around the sides of beds (cassapanche) could have painted panels, as could the tall backs of day-beds (lettuccie); Botticelli’s *Primavera* is now thought to have been fixed to the wall above a lettuccio. Vasari mentions that Florentine artists painted narrative scenes with figures ‘not only on cassoni [wedding chests], but also lettuccie, on wall-panels and friezes’. The most celebrated decoration of a bedchamber was
that commissioned in 1515 by Pierfrancesco Borgherini for the Medici Palace in via Larga, Florence. Panels by Granacci, Bacchiacca and Pontormo illustrating the story of Joseph survive; they may have surrounded the bed and been placed above it. Sadly, these and other rare surviving examples of bed decoration have been dismantled.7

The other possibility is that the panels come from a ceiling – in which case they would be decorating an entire room and may have come from a much larger set. In 1969 Marabottini suggested that they were part of a wooden ceiling decoration, the narrow panels on the beams, the larger three in between them. He linked them with the ‘due suffitti di camerini, dipinti dall’istesso Polidoro con varie historiette in chiaro scuro’ in the Neapolitan palace of the poet Bernardino Rota, as mentioned by Celano in his guide to the city of 1692. The ceiling had been dismantled by this date. There has been much debate as to whether the Royal Collection panels fit this description of ‘chiaroscuro’, since although the range of colours is restricted, they are polychrome. However, Frizell did acquire these panels in Naples. In the most in-depth study of the artist to date, Pierluigi Leone de Castris believes that the panels could have come from ceilings in the palace which were probably dismantled before 1630.8 They could be dated c.1527–8, when the artist returned to Naples for a second time. The idea of a ceiling ‘ensemble’ is supported by the fact that some elements appear to have been designed to be seen from below: the capitals of the columns of Cupid’s palace in Psyche Discovers Cupid (fig. 30) and the fountain on the right; the nymphs in A Boating Party (no. 5.vii) and the goats in Putti with Goats (no. 5.vi). Polidoro exaggerated the size of features such as hands so that they could be seen at a distance, and strengthened some outlines with dark paint. The simplest solution, which would explain this low viewpoint and the broad-brush technique, is that the panels formed a frieze around the wall just below the ceiling and that the larger scenes were either set below them or in the ceiling itself. There are a series of nail holes running vertically down the centre of no. 5.i; this panel may have been primed and painted in situ.

The panels can be dated to c.1527–8 by analogy with the frescoes in the Cappella di Fra’ Mariano, San Silvestro al Quirinale, executed in 1524–7 by Polidoro in collaboration with Maturino.9 The weighty tree on the right in Psyche Exposed on a Rock and the precisely defined vegetation and open colonnade of Cupid’s palace in Psyche Discovers Cupid recall these features in the story of St Catherine of Siena and St Mary Magdalene in San Silvestro, and there is a sense of airy vastness in both works.10 The superbly skilful touch – bold, free and yet accurate – suggests a date for these panels shortly after the San Silvestro frescoes.

Fig. 30 Polidoro da Caravaggio, Psyche Discovers Cupid; oil on panel, 159.5 × 184.2 cm (RCIN 401699)
5.1 Psyche Exposed on a Rock
5.v A Nymph, Satyrs and Putti

5.vi Putti with Goats

5.vii A Boating Party
with Maturino, but this is impossible if they originated in Naples where Polidoro moved in 1527, without Maturino, who had been killed in the Sack of Rome in the same year. Scholars have claimed to see evidence of Maturino’s hand in the Cupid and Psyche panels and at least two of the frieze panels: Nymphs and Satyrs and Nymphs Pulling a Boat. It is difficult to detect two hands in the panels exhibited here and the single name Polidoro remains the most probable attribution.

During Polidoro’s apprenticeship, Raphael’s workshop was engaged in projects for Cardinal Bibbiena (Loggia and Bathroom of 1516) and Leo X (Loggia in the Vatican Palace of 1518–19). The decoration in these Loggie was inspired by the recently discovered grotte (‘caves’), the buried interiors of Nero’s Roman palace, the Domus Aurea. The antique decorative schemes, full of fantastic and playful images, were known as grottesche (‘grotesques’ in English) after their place of origin; and they provided a generation of Italian artists with their decorative language. The six decorative panels here are some of the most lively and archaeologically accurate examples of the genre. Many of their distinctive qualities derive from the Domus Aurea: the playful fantasy of the subject matter, the speedy technique, the use of framing lines and the way in which the frieze-like arrangement of figures and animals are silhouetted on a base, which floats against a background of ochre and red-brown.

The series also shows Polidoro’s immersion in the pictorial language of his master, Raphael. These grotesques are sometimes taken from Raphael rather than their ultimate source in the antique: many bizarre episodes can be traced back to the Vatican Loggie or Cardinal Bibbiena schemes, often varied and transformed with great wit. These putti also sometimes adopt the poses of Raphael’s heroic life-sized figure groups, almost as if parodying them. In Putti Playing with Mallets and Balls (no. 5, iv) the child riding on the back of his companion recalls the son carrying his father in The Fire in...
the Borgo (Stanza dell’Incendio, Vatican); the turbaned putto recalls the mother and boy in the centre of the same fresco. The putto ‘windsurfing’ in a shell in *Putti Pulling in a Net* (no. 5.iii) is an ironic quote from Galatea steering her shell in the famous *Galatea of c.1512* in the Farnesina; her dolphins appear behind, pulling the putto pretending to be Neptune. In *Putti with Swans* (no. 5.ii) the child pushing an oar quotes from the boatman in *The Battle of Ostia* (Stanza dell’Incendio, Vatican); the kneeling putto is a parody of a kneeling figure in *The Miracle of the Mass at Bolsena* (Stanza d’Eliodoro, Vatican).

Polidoro was also indebted to Raphael and to the antique for the serious scenes in this ensemble, as well as for the fantastical decorative elements. The Louvre panel, *The Reception of Psyche into Olympus* (fig. 31), recalls Raphael’s story of Cupid and Psyche in the Loggia of the Chigi Palace (Farnesina) of 1518–19. The abandoned figure of Psyche on her rock (in no. 5.i) is derived from the famous antique sculpture in the Vatican Museum showing Ariadne sleeping on a rock, although then believed to represent Cleopatra. Polidoro may also have studied this pose from the figure of Calliope in Raphael’s *Parnassus* (Stanza della Segnatura, Vatican; fig. 32): Psyche’s baton certainly seems to echo Calliope’s trumpet. Perhaps the close-knit group of bystanders beside the tree in this panel was also inspired by the similar group in Raphael’s *Parnassus*. Gnann has pointed out that the horse and the man leading it down to the water are also found in the engraving *Landscape with a Squire*, after Titian (Bibliothèque Royale, Paris), suggesting that Polidoro was looking at Venetian art and specifically Giorgione and early Titian.

Polidoro learned from Raphael the idea of re-creating the decoration of classical antiquity; but he did so with a wit, freedom and spirit of his own. This rare surviving example of his work gives some insight into the power and brilliance of his Roman façade decoration, which generations of young artists used as a visual textbook.
1. Vasari describes them as being ‘in chiaroscuro, in imitation of bronze, or in clay’, Vasari 1906 edn, v, p. 147.

2. Maddicott 1999, pp. 17–18. For the Louvre panel see Bacou 1983, no. p. 111, pp. 135–6, where the painting is attributed to Maturino.


7. Other examples of painted decoration are the painted female figure on a bedhead in Antiochus and Stratonice by the Master of the Stratonice Panels, and a bed with a painted vista next to it in The Birth of the Virgin attributed to Giulio II; see Thornton 1991, p. 131, and Schottmüller 1928, p. xi, no. 58.

8. Marabottini 1972, pp. 56–62, 255–8, note 58. According to Celano, when the ceilings were dismantled Gaspare Roomer acquired the paintings, sending most to Flanders. The remaining twelve, the best, were sold after his death in 1674 to the Marchese de los Velez, who took them to Spain. By 1650 Roomer had formed a noteworthy collection recorded by Capaccio in 1650 (published 1654, pp. 816–7). It is just possible that Frizell acquired the Royal Collection set in the 1660s, at about the same time and from the same place as Roomer acquired his set. Celano 1692, i, pp. 94–6; Shearman 1983, p. 199; Leone de Castris 2001, pp. 268–77. The author is indebted to Pierluigi Leone de Castris for his advice.


10. Leone de Castris 2001, pp. 212–47; see also Leone de Castris 2001, p. 274, for parallels with Polidoro drawings of the same date.

11. Dacos 1982, pp. 9–28. Various characteristics betray the influence of Peruzzi, who trained Maturino: the arrangement of figures in one plane; their debt to classical sources; the repetition of figures; the synchronised movement of the nymphs; and the exaggerated distortions of faces. Lilius (1981, i, pp. 349–57) and Bacou (1983, pp. 135–6) attribute the Louvre panel to Maturino working with Polidoro.

12. Dacos 1969; Dacos and Furlan 1987; Dacos 1986; Polidoro inscribed his name in the grotte, as was the custom.


14. Although the putto carrying a book is also similar to the figure carrying scrolls on the left in The School of Athens, Stanza della Segnatura, Vatican. Dacos (1982, pp. 21, 28, notes 67–8) has suggested antique gems and cameos were used as sources; see also Florence 1973, pp. 43, 146–7, 164–7.


PROVENANCE
Probably acquired either by Frederick, Prince of Wales, or by George III; first securely identifiable in the Kensington 1818 inventory, as by Andrea del Sarto.

REFERENCES
Shearman 1983, no. 211; Costamagna 1994, no. 73

According to Vasari, Pontormo studied with Leonardo da Vinci, Piero di Cosimo and Mariotto Albertinelli before 1512, after which he and Rosso Fiorentino (1494–1540) assisted Andrea del Sarto for two years. The two younger artists have been called Mannerists because of the strange proportions, exaggerated postures and self-conscious elegance of their figures. After Sarto’s death in 1530 Pontormo was the leading painter in Florence.

This painting, often referred to as the ‘Madonna with the Book’, is one of at least twenty-five versions of the subject, making it the most successful painting by Pontormo and the most copied work of the period in Florence. The Virgin is seated on the ground, like a Madonna of Humility; she holds a book open with one hand while the Christ Child looks up ecstatically, perhaps from contemplation of the words on a folded piece of paper, now transparent, in his left hand. In the background Joseph holds his saw in one hand while reaching to take some cherries (the fruit of paradise and symbolising heaven) from a container held by a young boy, possibly St John the Baptist or an older manifestation of the Virgin’s mother. It is likely that Vasari refers to this composition, given his knowledge of the artist and its popularity, in which case it must be one of the three paintings of the Virgin mentioned in his life of Pontormo. By far the most likely candidate is the first, ‘a most beautiful painting of our Lady’, with which the artist paid his stonemason, Rossino, for building work on his house. Other circumstances connected with this building work mentioned in Vasari’s text suggest that it must have taken place in the early to mid-1530s, although no documents exist to confirm this. The painting was later acquired by Ottaviano de’ Medici and was in the collection of his son, Alessandro, by 1568, where it remained until his death in 1605; these collections were accessible to artists, which would explain why the composition became so well known.

It has been suggested that the prominent unfinished building, the depiction of Joseph as a carpenter and the humble pose of the Madonna are all references to the manual trade of the recipient of this painting. It has also been proposed that the themes were unusual at this date but would have appealed later to the promoters of the Counter Reformation, which would account for the popularity of the composition.

The seated Virgin and the turn of Christ’s head above his bare arm recall Michelangelo’s Doni Tondo (Uffizi) of c.1504–6, as does the nearly nude figure of St John the Baptist in the background. Christ looking back over his shoulder recalls Michelangelo’s Taddei Tondo (Royal Academy of Arts, London) of the same date. The smiling face of the Virgin and the turn of her legs to the left can be found in the figure of St Anne in Leonardo da Vinci’s Virgin and Child and St Anne (Louvre) of c.1508–18. Leonardo may have begun this in Florence where Pontormo would have seen it, particularly if, as Vasari states, he was apprentice to Leonardo at this time. The Virgin in Andrea del Sarto’s lost Virgin and Child with St John, painted for a tabernacle outside Porta a Pinti in Florence in 1522–5, known through copies, is also particularly close to the Virgin. The arrangement of figures has been compared with that in the Joseph tapestries, Palazzo Quirinale, Rome, of 1545–6, but the figures here have a naturalism more characteristic of the second half of the 1530s, when the impact of Michelangelo on Pontormo’s work had diminished.

No version of this painting has been unanimously accepted as the original, though various candidates have been proposed: in Munich; in the Uffizi; formerly in the Ferrari and Frascione collection; a fragment now in the Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, MA; and the one sold at Sotheby’s, New York, in 2003, now in the Yale University Art Museum. The Royal Collection version has as good a claim as any, although it has elements, like the blank page of the book and the ogee shape of the arch, which are only followed in one other copy. The technique suggests that this is an autograph work (and not a copy) and is very suggestive of Pontormo’s hand. The underdrawing is sketchy but firm. Planning lines map out folds of drapery. The lines are short, seem to stop and start and vary in pressure. It seems to have been executed freehand rather than transferred from a cartoon, which clearly happened in the Yale version. The servant girl is brilliantly and speedily painted without any underdrawing. There are several changes between underdrawing and painting: a dome-like shape was drawn through the buildings to the left of the Virgin; two windows were moved in the building on the left; several changes were made in the background around the Virgin, which was left unresolved; Joseph’s stool and John’s legs extend under this area; the contour of the upper muscles of Christ’s left arm was slightly revised (see fig. 33). There has been some deterioration in the paint layer over time: the blue of the Virgin’s veil and Joseph’s tunic has discoloured, making...
some of the transitions from shadow to highlight more abrupt than intended. But the very thin paint layer we see is original and typical of Pontormo, who allowed the ground to show through and relied on subtle transitions from shadow to light to create form. This effect is characteristic of Pontormo’s autograph works and contrasts with the solid paint layer of the other versions. It is a fine example of Pontormo’s lucid defining of forms. It is proposed that the painting is by Pontormo, even if it is not the source of all the other versions.

1 Pittaluga (1933, pp. 354–66) identified twelve painted versions; Shearman (1983, pp. 201–4) lists twenty-one versions in addition to no. 8 and including one drawing. His list was updated and amended by Cox-Rearick and Freedberg (1983, pp. 523–7); Costamagna (1994, pp. 225–9, no. 73) listed twenty-five versions. In addition, Sotheby’s, New York, 23 January 2003, lot 37, now in the Yale University Art Gallery, was a previously unknown fragment showing the Virgin half-length with the Christ Child, with a French provenance dating from the early seventeenth century.

2 Shearman identifies the fruit in the container as grapes. In other versions they have been identified as flowers or nails.


4 Caroline Elam’s suggestion recorded in Cox-Rearick and Freedberg 1983, p. 527, note 34.


7 Shearman (1983) suggested that it could have been omitted by Vasari, as had Clapp (1916, p. 217) and Forster (1966, p. 153).

8 Vasari 1906 edn, vi, pp. 279–80; Cox-Rearick and Freedberg 1983, p. 523; Costamagna 1994, p. 226. Gamba (1921), followed by Pittaluga and others (most recently Cox-Rearick and Freedberg 1983), connected this gift with the Madonna del libro. Another possibility was the painting of the Virgin given by Duke Cosimo to a Spanish nobleman in c. 1545–6, who took it to Spain. A third was found in Pontormo’s house at his death in 1556 and sold to Pietro Salvati. When he died in 1564 his collection was confiscated by Duke Cosimo.


12 Becherucci 1944, p. 20; Cox-Rearick and Freedberg 1983, p. 226.


15 Shearman 1983, p. 202; Costamagna 1994, nos. 73, 73-8, 73-20 and 73-22; Sotheby’s, New York, 23 January 2003, lot 37. Cox-Rearick proposed that the Fogg version was the original in 1983, but subsequently retracted this opinion in favour of the Yale painting in 2003, which Costamagna also believed was the lost original.

16 See reproductions of underdrawing in Sotheby’s catalogue.

17 This revision is apparently followed in all the other versions. In addition, the fingers of Christ and his left foot were at a different angle. The indentations in the profile of the arch were added later.

18 The blue is probably decayed smalt. The painting was restored by Brealey in 1973–5 and in 2006 by Rupert Featherstone.
7. **Portrait of a Lady in Green c.1528–32**

Oil on poplar panel
76.6 × 66.2 cm
Inscribed on the back, in pen, in a sixteenth-century hand: Di Mano di Raffaello da Urbino
RCIN 405754

**Provenance**
Probably Gonzaga collection, Mantua; acquired by Charles I; valued at £100 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to Bass and others 19 December 1651; recovered at the Restoration

**References**
Shearman 1983, no. 55; Strehlke 2004, no. 20

Bronzino was trained first by Raffaellino del Garbo and then Jacopo Pontormo, whose style influenced his own work. He collaborated with Pontormo on several occasions. In 1530 Bronzino worked in Urbino and Pesaro for two years. On his return to Florence he dominated the city’s artistic scene, and as court artist to Cosimo de’ Medici executed many sophisticated portraits.

There has always been some uncertainty about the authorship of this magnificent portrait. The sixteenth-century inscription (quoted above) and early inventories attributed it to Raphael; subsequent inventories cite Andrea del Sarto and Sebastiano del Piombo; twentieth-century opinion has attributed the portrait to Pontormo, or to artists in Emilia or Lombardy, such as Girolamo da Carpi. Scholars have used the comparison with Bronzino’s *Portrait of a Lady in Red* of c.1532–5 (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt; fig. 34) to suggest that this work is too informal in pose, too simple in setting and too imprecisely finished to be by the same artist. In fact the simplicity of the setting is very similar to that in Bronzino’s portrait *Lorenzo Lenzi* (Castello Sforzesco, Milan), which has also been ascribed to Pontormo. Both can be placed early in Bronzino’s career in the early 1530s, when he was strongly influenced by the older artist. The direct gaze and the deceptively simple pose of the figure are also typical of Bronzino’s portraits. The detail of the treatment is directly comparable to the *Lady in Red*: the turn of the head, the reflected light in the shadows of the face, the very slightly parted lips, the depiction of the rings worn on rounded hands. Above all, the precision of Bronzino’s technique is evident here, memorably summed up in Hazlitt’s description of this work: ‘The portrait of a lady with green and white purpled sleeves (like the leaves and flower of the water-lily, and as clear) is admirable.’

This portrait has been connected with Bronzino’s period working within the Duchy of Urbino. He is recorded at Pesaro from the end of 1530 until 1532, and Vasari wrote that while he worked for the Duke of Urbino, Francesco Maria della Rovere, ‘he painted the portrait of a daughter of Matteo Sofferoni’. John Shearman suggested that this portrait might be Sofferoni’s daughter, and that it would be at the court of Urbino rather than in Florence that a portrait by Bronzino could be mistaken for one by Raphael, hence the inscription on the back of the painting. The portrait is not recorded in Florentine inventories and it was from a northern court that Charles I acquired the painting in 1629–32.

Sofferoni was a customs official in Florence and a member of the same literary and artistic circle as Pontormo and Bronzino. Bronzino was an especially close friend of Matteo’s sister’s husband, the swordmaker Tofano.
Allori. When Tofano Allori died in 1541 Bronzino assumed financial responsibility for his family, moved into the Allori house and trained his son, Alessandro, as a painter. Tofano’s grandson, Cristofano Allori, also became a painter and executed *Judith with the Head of Holofernes* (no. 93), which he signed ‘Bronzino’, as was his habit, in honour of his father’s master. Matteo Sofferoni was a merchant rather than a nobleman; this fact and his friendship with Bronzino might explain the greater sense of intimacy and informality in this portrait compared with the slightly later and almost certainly patrician *Lady in Red*.6

Costume historians are divided over whether the sitter’s clothes are northern Italian or Florentine. Two elements are perplexing: one would expect a headdress of this date to be much larger, matching the sleeves in effect, and the sleeves to be gathered tightly at the elbows, as in the *Lady in Red*, rather than loosely as here.7 The clothes bear some resemblance to the *Portrait of a Lady* (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt) attributed to the north Italian Girolamo da Carpi, and more recently to Peter de Kempeneer. The Florentine *Portrait of a Lady* by Domenico Puligo (Firle Place, Lewes) wears similar clothes, but the dress and head-dress are closest to the Bronzino *Lady in Red* (fig. 34). If the sitter is Matteo’s daughter, it is less likely that she accompanied him to Urbino and was painted in north Italian fashion, and more likely that she was painted in Florentine dress in Florence either before or after Bronzino’s visit to the duchy.8

Recent technical analysis lends more credence to the attribution to Bronzino. X-radiography has revealed particular signs of damage along the top and bottom edges of the panel, matched on other Bronzino panels.9 Although many preparatory drawings by Bronzino may have been lost, it seems that he preferred to paint a composition to a fairly advanced state and then sometimes make radical changes. X-radiography of the present painting further shows that Bronzino mapped out an earlier face to the right and on a more vertical axis than the final version. The chin of the sitter is aligned with this earlier position of the head, contributing to the fascinating distortion of the portrait.10 The other adjustments are also typical of the small changes that Bronzino liked to make.11

1 See Shearman 1983, pp. 59–61, and Costamagna 1994, p. 299, no. 62, for previous attributions. The display of the *Lady in Green* and *Lady in Red* in the Philadelphia exhibition of 2004 (see Philadelphia 2004, pp. 98–9), together for the first time, led many scholars to conclude that they were by the same artist.


3 Hazlitt 1903, p. 43.


5 Pilliod 2001, pp. 97–103, discusses Bronzino’s connections with the Sofferoni family.

6 One of her rings establishes her connection with the Medici family in Florence. Philadelphia 2004, p. 108.

7 The author is grateful to Jane Bridgeman for pointing this out. Shearman (1983, p. 61) proposes that the costume is north Italian; Cox-Kearick (2005, p. 211) that it is Florentine.


9 For example, Lorenzo Lotto (Castello Sforzesco, Milan), *Cosimo I de’ Medici as Orpheus* (Philadelphia Museum of Art). Possibly the removal of upper and lower battens has contributed to these damages. The author wishes to thank Mark Tucker and Carl Strehlke for their suggestions.

10 This repainting would explain the thicker layers of paint in the face, which are not typical of the artist’s flesh painting.

11 The chemise was originally fastened up at the neck. The unfastened collar contributes to the informality of the portrait.
**FRANCESCO SALVIATI** (FRANCESCO DE’ ROSSI)
Florence 1510–Rome 1563

8. *The Virgin and Child with an Angel* c.1538–40

Oil on poplar panel
112.3 × 84.5 cm
RCIN 405778

**PROVENANCE**
First recorded in the Queen’s Dining Room at Kensington in the 1818 inventory (185) as by Lorenzo Sabatini

**REFERENCES**
Shearman 1983, no. 229; Mortari 1992, no. 25; Cheney 1963a, p. 355

During the middle years of the sixteenth century Florentine painting was dominated by three figures: Bronzino (see no. 7), Vasari (no. 9) and Francesco Salviati. All three developed the style known as Mannerism. They created elegant, polished, sculptural-looking figures and used bright, intense colours. Salviati trained (along with Vasari) in the studio of the sculptor Baccio Bandinelli and joined that of Andrea del Sarto in 1529–30. In 1531 he was invited to join the household of Cardinal Giovanni Salviati in Rome, and adopted his name. Salviati worked throughout Italy, visiting Venice in c.1540 to paint two ceiling decorations in the Grimani family palace, and was one of several artists to bring the Florentine Mannerist style to the city.

This painting exemplifies the combination of realism and artificiality and powerful elegance of Salviati’s works. In the nineteenth century it was thought to have been painted by Lorenzo Sabatini or Sebastiano del Piombo. Maso da San Friano and Taddeo Zuccaro were also suggested, until the attribution to Salviati was made by Philip Pouncey in 1962.¹

The Virgin Mary looks away from the sleeping Christ Child, protected by her arms, while an angel looks down at Christ through a transparent veil, just visible between his fingers. The motif is unusual and may be a reference to the liturgical cloth that veiled statues and pictures during Passiontide and covered the hands of the officiating priest at High Mass. Such a transparent cloth is often draped over the body of the Christ Child, who instead is seen here nude. Perhaps the angel foresees the future Passion of Christ, whose sleeping posture reminds us of his death and entombment, although the expressions of both the angel and the Virgin are of reverence rather than mourning.

Another version of this painting, with a landscape behind the Virgin, was recently acquired by the National Gallery of Canada (see fig. 35). A third version, probably a copy of the Ottawa painting because it has a landscape in the background, is in the Palazzo Ducale at Urbino. Detailed technical examination of the Royal Collection and Ottawa versions reveals that the panel size and preparation are identical, which suggests that they were produced in the same studio and at the same time.² Technical examination also suggests that they are both by the hand of Salviati.³ The Royal Collection painting has many effects which are the opposite of the mechanical labour of the copyist: the angel’s brooch and the clasp on the Virgin’s waist are painted ‘wet-in-wet’, with no underdrawing; there are distinctive little hatched strokes, in the red and blue of the angel’s wing, on the top of the Virgin’s turban, around the drapery on her shoulders, and on the fingers of Christ. The evidence of the underdrawing and tracings of the compositions suggests that Salviati began the Royal Collection painting first, using a cartoon but changing the design as it progressed. The same cartoon and the finished Royal Collection painting then became the basis for the Ottawa version. The underdrawing for the Ottawa painting has energetic lines, all following a cartoon, but fast, recalling Salviati’s drawing technique in pen and ink.⁴ Some strong strokes mark out essential details in the Royal Collection version, but many of the equivalent lines are more delicate, some possibly freehand. In some areas where the Ottawa painting differs from the final appearance of no. 8 it follows its underdrawing, for example in the position of the angel’s head and the line of the Virgin’s nose.⁵ In other areas the Ottawa painting matches the final appearance of no. 8, though no underdrawing lies beneath it, for example in the Virgin’s folded-back sleeve. It is not unknown for Salviati to repeat a design in this way: in the 1540s the *Virgin and Child, St John and an Angel* (Uffizi) was repeated without a landscape background and with other small changes to become an allegory of Charity (Alte Pinakothek, Munich).⁶

![Image](image-url)

Fig. 35 Francesco Salviati, *The Virgin and Child with an Angel*; oil on panel, 112.3 × 83 cm (National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa)
Despite these two works being autograph and identical in date, there are striking differences between them. There are several compositional differences. Of more importance, the Canadian version gives more of a satin sheen to the drapery and a polished effect to the skin tones, both effects recalling The Annunciation (San Francesco a Ripa) of 1533–4, one of Salviati’s earliest documented works. The landscape framed by dark branches is almost precisely the same. The Royal Collection painting, on the other hand, is more broadly painted, more solid, less finished and less refined, which suggests a later date. The combining of hot and cool colours and the hatched technique recalls Rosso Fiorentino’s work. The spiralling curls and profile view of the angel resemble the angels in the Pietà with Four Angels (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston). The composition and angel have been compared to the Madonna of the Parrot of c. 1543 (Prado), but the figures are slimmer in this later painting.7

The painterly technique in the Royal Collection version may reflect works Salviati saw on his trip north. Such comparisons, if we are right in believing that they were produced at the same time, suggest a date of 1538–40 for both works.

1 Letter in the Royal Collection picture files, 6 January 1962. Mrs Jameson suggested Maso da San Friano in 1842, Voss (1940, ii, p. 450) Taddeo Zuccaro in 1920 and the attribution to Sabbatini was made in the 1818 inventory of Kensington Palace. The 1860s Redgrave sheet has ‘Sebastiano del Piombo’, which was crossed out and replaced with ‘Sabbatini’. Accepted by Cheney (1963a, p. 355). Mortari 1992, pp. 115–16, no. 25.
2 The Royal Collection painting 112.3 × 83.8 cm (84.5 cm with later additions); National Gallery of Canada 112.3 × 83.2 cm. The construction of the panels is very similar, with two horizontal battens in similarly fashioned grooves; the upper batten has been removed from the Royal Collection painting. The thick panel (2.5 cm) was primed with different priming for different areas on the Royal Collection painting, and with a dark semi-transparent paint layer over the whole panel for the Ottawa version. The author is indebted to Stephen Gritt, David Franklin and Michael Hirst for their work comparing the two paintings.
3 The dark, semi-transparent underpainting in the Ottawa version serves the same purpose as the selective priming in the Royal Collection painting. There is grey-greenish underpainting under the Virgin’s pink-red robe, as in the Royal Collection painting, but less visible. The modelling, where not smoothed away in the Ottawa version, is the same: see for example the wings of the angels, the painting of shadows and the modelling of the turbans. The angel with tightly modelled sleeve in the Royal Collection painting is the area closest in effect to the Ottawa painting.
4 For example the pen and ink drawing for Standing male nude (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Dijon, jch 37), Paris 1998, no. 14. Some underdrawing lines in the Ottawa painting are repeated or adjusted: for example, the back of the Virgin’s shawl and down her left arm. At her waist the lines are zigzagging, the folds reiterated twice.
5 In places the sharp hook lines of the underdrawing correspond precisely. Tracings of the paintings can be shifted to match exactly. Similar matching of under-drawn ideas in the Royal Collection painting used for the Ottawa version are the Virgin’s head and neck. The feet of Christ were drawn slightly lower in the Royal Collection painting and then raised. The under-drawing in the Ottawa version matches the first idea for the toes and was then adjusted. The incisions marking the legs of the Christ Child in the Royal Collection painting match the final Ottawa painting, but not the buttocks.
6 Virgin and Child, St John and an Angel (Uffizi, Florence, inv. 6064) and Carità (Alte Pinakothek, Munich, inv. L.1044); See Mortari 1992, p. 114, nos. 17, 18.
7 Cheney 1963a, p. 355. Salviati’s continual travelling, his ability to assimilate many influences and the loss of his early work in Florence make it difficult to date this painting. The Royal Collection painting has been dated c. 1548 by Mortari (1992) and to the 1550s by Shearman (1983).
Giorgio Vasari
Arezzo 1511 – Florence 1574

9. **Venus and Cupid c.1543**

Oil on panel
131.0 × 199.2 cm (128.3 × 193 cm without the additions)
RCIN 405486
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Giorgio Vasari was born in Arezzo, where he received a classical education. In 1524 he came to Florence in the company of Cardinal Silvio Passerini, tutor of Alessandro and Ippolito de’ Medici, and joined the workshop of Andrea del Sarto. By 1527 he had transferred to the workshop of the sculptor Baccio Bandinelli, where he worked with Francesco Salvati. For the rest of his career he worked for the Medici family, his most prestigious undertaking being the remodelling of the Palazzo Vecchio from 1555 to 1572. Today he is better known for his biographies of painters, *Le vite dei più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architettori* (published in 1550 and enlarged in 1568), than for his paintings.

It is from Vasari’s famous book that we learn of the cartoon Michelangelo made in about 1532 of ‘a nude Venus with a Cupid who kisses her’ to be painted by Pontormo for his (Michelangelo’s) friend and fellow republican, Bartolomeo Bettini. The painting was to be put in the centre of a room decorated with portraits (by Bronzino) of Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio, ‘with the intention of having there all the other poets who have sung of love in Tuscan prose and verse’.1 Pontormo’s painting was confiscated by Duke Alessandro de’ Medici and is now in the Accademia, Florence.2

Michelangelo’s design was widely available: Bettini retained the cartoon, which could be studied at his house (until he left Florence in 1536) and Pontormo’s painting could be seen in the Palazzo Vecchio. It is one of the most replicated images from the period, and the Royal Collection picture is one of at least seventeen surviving versions of the design. It is also the closest in size and appearance to the Pontormo ‘original’, and thus clearly a good copy executed by a Florentine during the sixteenth century. Shearman narrowed down the field of possible attributions by suggesting that this might be one of three or four versions of the design that Vasari mentions painting himself during the years 1541–4.3 Vasari often paired it with *Leda and the Swan*, also after Michelangelo, and sent at least one pair to Venice.

The attribution to Vasari has been widely accepted.4 Although he is following Michelangelo’s design, it is possible to recognise Vasari’s distinctive colour range: the pale flesh, like smooth marble, the golden curls of both figures, the hot colours of the red ribbon and flushed cheeks of Cupid and the pinks and blues in his wings and his quiver. Trying to connect this painting with one of the versions of the theme mentioned by Vasari is more difficult, especially as the sizes do not quite match.5 It has recently been suggested that the Royal Collection version was painted for Bindo Altoviti, Vasari’s patron and banker in Rome. Other surviving versions of the subject, once given to Vasari, have in recent years been attributed to other hands, which hampers the process of comparison and elimination.6 There is extensive chalk underdrawing, as for all the copies, which suggests that Michelangelo drew the whole composition, including the landscape. But the versions replicate Pontormo’s colours, which means that Vasari and others had access to it.

The meaning of the painting must be interpreted with reference to Michelangelo’s original intention: like Botticelli’s famous *Mars and Venus* (National Gallery, London), this is a *spalliera* painting or decorative panel for a room and it was designed to be seen from below.7 It would have contributed towards a room celebrating the complex love poetry of Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio. Michelangelo was himself a love poet and a friend of the patron, so we should expect the symbolism to be subtle, ambiguous and complex.8 Venus and Cupid kiss. Venus points to her heart with her left hand and, with her right, possibly to an altar to Venus, decorated with masks, Cupid’s bow, a pile of arrows, a bowl of roses and a statuette of a wounded man. Perhaps she is not pointing but rather stealing one of Cupid’s arrows, which may explain why he glances slyly back at them. The other arrows spill from his quiver, heads down, possibly wounding Venus’s thigh.

The figures are so cleverly interlocked that it is not clear who is deceiving whom, or the nature of the love represented. This may be a version of the story of Venus disarming Cupid, a frequent subject in this period.9 Or it may be the episode recounted in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, when as Venus kisses Cupid she is unwittingly wounded by one of his arrows and falls in love with Adonis.10 If this is the case then the wounded figure probably represents the tragic outcome of this romance: Adonis dead, gored by a boar. This would also fit with the mourning veil on the altar and the dark clouds in the sky.11 The roses have been interpreted as alluding to the transitory nature of the joys of love, the masks as symbols of falsehood.12 There may be some suggestion here of the struggle between sensual and spiritual love, which is such an important theme in Michelangelo’s poetry.13 In this case the masks could be intended to suggest the deceptive nature of sensual pleasure.14 If a carnal versus spiritual interpretation is intended, Venus is more likely to represent the higher form of love and Cupid the lower. Her figure is heroically powerful, uniting the sexes as described in the memorable letter by Pietro Aretino, who praised the painting because Michelangelo had ‘made the muscles of male in the body of the female’, a Venus who was ‘moved by masculine and feminine sentiments’.15

Venus’s pose recalls the reclining figures of *Dawn* and *Night* that Michelangelo completed a year before this design (in 1531) for the sarcophagi of the tombs of Lorenzo and Giuliano de’ Medici, in the New Sacristy of San Lorenzo. The mask of the old man in the painting recalls the one that *Night* rests upon. Michelangelo’s idea of a reclining Venus may have been inspired by the paintings by Titian he would have seen on his recent trip (in 1529) to Venice and Ferrara. The athletic, languid and androgynous power of Venus has caused as
much disgust as delight: Hogarth declared that this “Grand Venus (as you are pleased to call it) has not Beauty enough for the Character of an English Cook-Maid.”16 At the time, however, it represented a powerful statement of the Florentine ideal of beauty, to be expressed through media such as sculpture and drawing, which accentuate form over colour. Titian himself reveals the influence of this figure in his Danae (Museo di Capodimonte, Naples) of 1545–6 and his nudes of the 1550s.


2 Conti 1893, p. 81; Clapp 1916, pp. 142–4; Costamagna 1994, pp. 217–21, no. 70. The Pontormo painting was the focus of the exhibition and in-depth study by Falletti and Nelson in Florence 2002a, pp. 187–90.


4 Costamagna 1994, p. 220, no. 70; Nelson in Florence 2002a, pp. 197–8, no. 28; Harb in Boston, 2003, p. 416. It is not included in catalogues of Vasari’s paintings, for example Corti 1989.

5 Harb in Boston 2003, pp. 417–17. Vasari describes the version for Bindo Altoviti as measuring 2⅓ × 3½ braccia (136 × 204 cm); the others he mentions measure 2½ × 3½ braccia (146 × 204 cm). No. 9 measures exactly the same as the Pontormo ‘original’ in the Accademia; that is, 2⅓ × 3½ braccia.

6 The painting in the Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, Naples, once attributed to Vasari, is now more plausibly attributed to his Flemish collaborator, Hendrik Van den Broek; see Costamagna 1994, p. 220, no. 70; Nelson in Florence 2002a, pp. 197–8. Two candidates in the National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin, and Galleria Colonna, Rome, are attributed to Vasari’s pupil Michele Tosini (1503–77); see Nelson in Florence 2002a, pp. 197–8 and 233–4, nos. 4 and 14.


9 Levey 1967, pp. 30–33.


11 See Levey 1967, pp. 30–33, for the idea of Adonis as the statuette.

12 Panofsky (p. 89) read them as fraud and falsehood, Milanesi (in Vasari 1878–85 edn, vi, pp. 291–5) as deceptiveness.

13 Nelson in Florence 2002a, pp. 29, 80–89.

14 Milanesi in Vasari 1878–85 edn, vi, pp. 291–5, summarised by De Tolnay 1943–60, i, pp. 108–9, 194–6; Thode (1908–13, i, p. 328) interprets the masks as symbols of two different kinds of love, of the choice whether to sink to the animal or rise to the ideal. Milanesi discusses Venus as sensual love. De Tolnay saw the painting as representing neither spiritual nor sensual love, but the moment of conflict between the two.


16 In his article signed Britophil in the St James’s Evening Post, 7–9 June 1737, Hogarth imagines an exchange between an honest man, who speaks these words, and an unscrupulous dealer, Mr Bubbleman; he goes on to explain that the picture he has in mind here is ‘A monstrous Venus at Kensington, valued at a Thousand Pounds, said to be painted by Michael Angelo, di Buonorotti, or Jacomo di Pontermo, or Sebastiano del Piombo.’ See Paulson 1971, i, p. 372, and ii, Appendix 1, pp. 400–93.
FEDERICO ZUCCARO
Sant’Angelo in Vado, Marche c.1540–42 – Ancona 1609

10. **Calumny c.1569–72**

Oil on canvas
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Federico Zuccaro followed his older brother Taddeo (no. 22) to Rome in the mid-1550s and initially worked under him, but friction between the two led Federico to travel in 1564 to Venice, the beginning of a long and itinerant career that took him as far afield as the Netherlands, Spain and England. He was involved in the foundation of the Accademia del Disegno in Florence in 1563 and the Accademia di San Luca in Rome in 1593–4, and his mission to raise the status of painting gave rise to his treatise of 1607, *L’idea de’ Pittori, Scultori, et Architetti* (‘The Idea [i.e. intellectual inspiration] of Painters, Sculptors and Architects’). Competitive, disputatious and enormously productive, he was responsible for training generations of artists who adopted his clear (if somewhat facile) manner.

This is one of two surviving versions of this composition; the other is larger, in an aqueous medium, in the Caetani collection, Rome (fig. 37). However, while the provenance of the Caetani version can be confidently traced, the early history of the Royal Collection painting is more open to debate. No scholar has, however, doubted that it is a fine autograph work by Federico Zuccaro.

The painting has been recently conserved at the Hamilton Kerr Institute. Examination with infra-red spectroscopy revealed sketchy under-drawing and minor changes of design between the drawing and painting stages, both of which suggest that this is an autograph work rather than a studio copy. This conservation work also removed areas of retouching and overpaint to reveal previously hidden passages of original paint: the nude woman to the right now holds an ermine (as in the original painting) rather than the dove which had been painted over it; Midas has his original ass’s ears, rather than the porcine ones painted over them.³

On the death of his brother Taddeo in September 1566, Federico took charge of the decoration of the Villa Farnese at Caprarola for Cardinal Alessandro Farnese. Letters between patron and artist in 1569 record disagreements over payment and later in that year one Jacopo Bertoia was brought in to replace Federico.³ This painting is Zuccaro’s response. It is one of three allegorical designs he executed at various times during his life in reaction to personal slights and to promote his ideas about painting. His *Lament of Painting* (*Il Lamento della Pittura*), a print of 1579, answered critics of his frescoes in the cathedral in Florence; his *Porta Virtutis* (*Gate of Virtue*) of 1581 defended his altarpiece for the church of the Madonna del Baraccano in Bologna against its detractors and resulted in his expulsion from Rome by Pope Gregory XIII in 1581.⁴ The connection between these three allegories and the personal circumstances they addressed were widely known and discussed at the time. In all three Federico uses classical mythology, adapted for personal use. The specific source for the *Calumny* is Lucian’s description of a lost fourth-century BC painting of exactly the same subject, painted in similar circumstances by the great Greek artist Apelles.⁵ Lucian’s description made the *Calumny of Apelles*, as it is always called, the world’s most famous lost painting. During the Renaissance it was discussed by Alberti in his *De Pictura* of 1434 and re-created in Botticelli’s famous painting (*Uffizi*). Federico’s is an adaptation rather than a re-creation, for, as Panofsky noted, it is ‘the Calumny with the Happy Ending’. In Lucian’s account Calumny drags the young man representing Innocence off...
by the hair in triumph, accompanied by Envy, Treachery and Deceit and followed by Repentance and Truth. Federico’s hero, by contrast, is led off, his dignity intact, under the protection of Mercury. A detailed explanation of the allegory here was written by the artist’s son Ottaviano Zuccaro, though he diplomatically passed over the specific reasons for the painting.7 Further information about the meaning is supplied by an engraving after the design by Cornelis Cort (fig. 36) in 1572 and later prints supplied with a key to the figures’ identities.9 A large-scale preparatory drawing for the whole painting is in Hamburg and one for the centre lower cartouche in Christ Church, Oxford.9

On the left sits King Midas, famous for his bad judgement and shown with ass’s ears. He is being turned against the innocent ‘hero’, by the figures of Suspicion and Calumny, the latter holding up a lighted torch in her left hand. Envy lurks in the shadows behind, with emaciated breast and snakes in her hair. Minerva, goddess of wisdom, restrains the King from releasing Rage, blindfolded and manacled.10 The animals represent the vices that thrive under bad government: a fox (Cruelty), a wolf (Malice), a toad (Avarice), a harpy (Greed) and a leopard (not mentioned in Ottaviano, but which in Dante symbolises Fraudulence).11 The man-serpent, brandishing snakes and trying to seize the hero’s ox-hide, is based on Dante’s description of Fraud in the Inferno Canto xvii.12 The hero wears an ox-hide and ivy garland to signify the toils and the rewards of serving this prince. The yoke and chains at his feet remind us that his dismissal releases him from this servitude. In the two paintings, but not in the Hamburg drawing or subsequent prints, Fraud has the features of Jacopo Bertoia, and the hero those of Federico himself.13 The hero is protected by Mercury, holding his caduceus, and is led away by a nude woman holding an ermine. The ermine’s winter coat is white (with a black tip on its tail); it was believed that the animal would rather die than soil its coat, and thus it became a symbol of purity.14 Ottaviano interpreted the group to mean that an innocent man is never abandoned by divine aid.15

In the background a view through a window (or a painting) shows a harvest destroyed by a storm. The inscription underneath the scene should read IMPAVIDUM FERIENT (‘though the heavens fall’), a reference to Horace’s description of the just man in Carmina 111, 3:7–8: ‘were the vault of heaven to break and fall upon him, its ruins would smite him undismayed’ (‘si fractus inlabatur orbis / Impavidum ferient ruinae’). The inscription on this version has been misleadingly repainted in the past so that it reads IN PAVIDUM.

The frame is an emblematic cornucopia: each corner bears symbols of Minerva, her aegis emblazoned with a Medusa’s head. Each side has a cartouche in the centre flanked by two fictive stone figures, interspersed with Federico’s own emblem of the sugar-loaf (zucchero). Reading anticlockwise, starting with the left-hand side, the cartouche shows Aeneas holding the Golden Bough he took on his journey to Hades, which symbolised for Ottaviano ‘the desire for virtue’. On the lower edge of the frame the cartouche shows Aeneas prevented by animals from climbing a hill surmounted by a temple of virtue, described by Ottaviano as a wolf (for ignorance), an ass (lasciviousness) and a wild boar (lust), although here they are an ass, a goat and a sheep. A ship in the background is tossed in a storm, symbolising the difficulty of the virtuous life.16 Two young men sit on either side of this cartouche; the one on the left embraces an ox, representing noble Toil; the one on the right breaks a yoke, signifying base Servitude.17 On the right-hand side of the frame the cartouche shows Hercules crowned with laurel, holding a palm of Victory and a shield of Minerva (with a Gorgon’s head), while he crushes and impales two monsters. Below the cartouche are putti with trumpets, to signify the fame and glory which should accompany Virtue, although, as Massing wrote, the two trumpets may represent good and bad
fame. On the upper border of the painted frame the cartouche shows Juno riding a chariot drawn by peacocks over a calm, windless sea upon which kingfishers (or halcyons) were said to nest (hence the phrase ‘Halcyon Days’). This scene symbolises the peace achieved by the virtuous. On the left of the cartouche Hercules appears with his club and the skin of the Hydra; on the right a younger man embraces an eagle and a lion, representing high and noble thoughts.

Federico makes a clever play here with space and with the ambiguous relationship of reality and artifice. We can read the whole as reality: a window opening on to a logically defined and artifice. We can read the whole as reality: a window opening on to a logically defined and

In the Hamburg drawing she holds two doves, therefore representing Innocence. In the Porta Virtutis a man and an ox represent hard work. According to Ottaviano these reinforce the theme that hard work is necessary to achieve virtue.

Calumny records Federico’s deep-felt anger for a slight now confused in history; it also incorporates moral and theoretical ideas about art in general. It has entered the language of art: Vincenzo Cartari’s manual Imagini de gli dei delli antichi (1615) quotes from it, while Rubens incorporated its design in his bookplates and drew a new interpretation of it to decorate his house.19

1 See Shearman 1983, pp. 299–303; Massing (J.M.) 1990, pp. 366–64; Acidini Luchinat 1998–9, ii, pp. 32–7; Luzio 1931, p. 101, no. 186. The painting has an unusual late seventeenth-century English frame in an Italianate style, similar to that on the Girolamo Forabosco Scene of Jealousy (Royal Collection, Levey 1991, no. 489a). This suggests that both these paintings joined the Royal Collection from the same English collection. The author is grateful to Giacomo Antonelli of the Fondazione Camillo Caetani for his assistance.

2 The only record of a previous restoration is in the Redgrave inventory: the painting had been ‘repaired’ by Pinti in 1687. It was conserved at the Hamilton Kerr Institute in 2005–6. For information on the technical examination and conservation of the painting see unpublished M.A. report by Tabitha Teuma, July 2005 and forthcoming paper by Renate Woudhuysen-Keller in the Hamilton Kerr Institute Bulletin. The author is very grateful for access to this material and for information from Renate Woudhuysen-Keller.


6 Machod 1972–73, i, pp. 126–38.

7 The account occurs in Ottaviano Zuccaro, Idea de’ concetti politici, morali e cristiani di diversi celebri Autori, 1628; see Panofsky 1939, p. 84; Massing (J.M.) 1990, pp. 197–200; Heikamp 1957, pp. 219ff. Shearman argues that Federico used Alberti’s Latin De Pictura because Calumny holds the torch in her left hand, but she holds the torch in this hand in Lucian’s account.


11 Panofsky, 1939, p. 84, and Massing (J.M.) 1990, p. 202 note that a dog, a lion, a wolf and a serpent menace Innocence in Bronzino’s design for the tapestry executed by Giovanni Rost.

12 See also Cast 1981, p. 130.

13 For Bertoia’s likeness see Partridge 1971, figs 19–20; for Federico’s likeness, compare the marriage scene fresco in the Palazzo Zuccari, Rome, and Taddeo’s portrait of him in the Sala dei Fatti Farnesiani of the Palazzo Farnese, Rome (see Acidini Luchinat 1998–9, i, pp. 5, 221, pl. 87). Weddigen (2000, pp. 201–2) argues that the innocent artist is not a self-portrait but has the likeness of Taddeo, whom Federico is defending.

14 An ermine is held by the young woman symbolising ‘Purity of Soul’ (Anima Candor) in Federico’s later fresco in his palace in Rome; Acidini Luchinat 1998–9, i, p. 210, pl. 63; Massing (J.M.) 1990, p. 202. In the Hamburg drawing she holds two doves, therefore representing Innocence.


16 Massing (J.M.) 1990, p. 205, discusses other contemporary interpretations of the shipwreck as the result of following a life of pleasure.

17 In Palazzo Zuccari Labor is represented by an elderly man holding an ox (Acidini Luchinat 1998–9, i, p. 210). In the Porta Virtutis a man and an ox represent hard work. According to Ottaviano these reinforce the theme that hard work is necessary to achieve virtue.


Leonardo da Vinci
Vinci, Tuscany 1452–Amboise, France 1519

11. Neptune c.1504

Black chalk
25.1 × 39.2 cm
Inscribed by the artist, upper centre: abassa ichavalli
RL 12570

Provenance
Bequeathed by the artist to Francesco Melzi (d. c. 1570); sold by his heirs to Pompeo Leoni (d. 1608); Thomas Howard, 2nd Earl of Arundel, by 1630; probably acquired by Charles II; Royal Collection by 1690; Inv. A, p. 36, Leonardo da Vinci Tom. III, '165, Neptune & four Horses - bold Sketch for a Fountain ... Black Chalk'
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Leonardo da Vinci was the archetype of the ‘Renaissance man’ – a painter, sculptor, architect, engineer, map-maker and anatomist, and student of geometry, optics, hydraulics and botany. Drawing was central to his researches, and the six hundred sheets by Leonardo at Windsor, covering almost all aspects of his activity, are the greatest treasure of the Royal Library.

This is a preparatory study for the highly finished drawing described by Giorgio Vasari:

For his good friend Antonio Segni, [Leonardo] drew on a sheet of paper a Neptune, with such draughtsmanship and diligence that it seemed entirely alive. The sea could be seen churned up, and his chariot drawn by sea horses, with fantastic creatures, sea monsters and winds, and some beautiful heads of sea gods. The drawing was given by Fabio, his son, to Giovanni Gaddi, with this epigram:

Pinxit Vergilius Neptunum: Pinxit Homerus
Dum maris undisoni per vada flectit equos.
Mente quidem vates illum conspicxit uterque
Vincius ast oculis; jureque vincit eos.

[Virgil and Homer both depicted Neptune driving his sea horses through the rushing waves. The poets saw him in their imaginations, but Vinci with his own eyes, and so he rightly vanquished them.]¹

Antonio Segni (c.1460–1512) had been appointed Master of the Papal Mint in 1497, though he did not reside permanently at the Vatican and travelled intermittently between Rome and his native Florence. He must have been an erudite collector, for Botticelli presented him with his Calumny of Apelles (Uffizi), and the friendship between Segni and Leonardo mentioned by Vasari would explain why the artist made such an exceptional drawing.

Segni’s Neptune is lost, and – strangely for a work that was famed during the sixteenth century – we have no certain record of it in a copy drawing or a print. A large drawing in the Accademia Carrara, Bergamo (fig. 38) has been claimed as at least a partial copy of Leonardo’s design, and the upper part of Neptune and the horses to the right there are very similar to those here. But while the rough head of a dragon-like monster, of a type often drawn by Leonardo, is visible here at the centre left edge of the sheet, the Bergamo drawing does not include any of the sea creatures (other
than Neptune’s horses) mentioned by Vasari. A drawing of the subject by Lelio Orsi in Lisbon may capture more of Leonardo’s spirit: it shows the god thigh-length in a low boat, flanked by frantic horses (some biting each other), tritons, nereids and a dolphin.²

The present sheet, in which Neptune is seen from the thighs up, carries Leonardo’s rough note to himself to ‘lower the horses’. The Bergamo drawing does show the god full-length, and with Neptune standing the design is significantly taller in its proportions than the elongated oval of the present sketch. While this shape resembles that of some antique cameos and carved gems, the few that show Neptune driving his chariot are arranged in profile rather than this more challenging frontal aspect. As has often been noted, an inspiration for Leonardo’s composition may instead have been a relief on a sarcophagus, then outside the church of Santa Maria in Aracoeli, Rome (and now in the Vatican), that shows Neptune standing thigh-length in a low boat drawn by four sea-horses breasting the waves and placed symmetrically at either side.³ The drawing must date from around 1504, when Leonardo was working on (among other projects) the composition of the Battle of Anghiari, which involves a comparable interweaving of man and horse; it is likely that Leonardo had visited Rome around that time, for in April 1505 he was reimbursed for customs duty on a parcel of his clothes sent from Rome.

---

PROVENANCE
Probably Queen Christina of Sweden; Cardinal Decio Azzolino; Pompeo Azzolino; Livio Odescalchi; purchased in Rome for George III; Inv. A, p. 49, Raffaello d’Urbino e Scuola, “Page 1. Elymas the Sorceror struck blind; the Composition the same as the large Cartoon. These small Drawings of Raphael were design’d by him in order to be Engraved by M Antonio & others. This Drawing was bought at Rome & is Engrav’d by A. Veneziano, 1516”

REFERENCES
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 803; Joannides 1983, no. 363; Oberhuber and Ferino Pagden 1983, no. 524; Clayton 1999, no. 27, with full earlier bibliography

On the election of Pope Leo X in 1513, Raphael (see no. 1) was already established as the leading painter in Rome. The degree of his involvement in a project in his latter years depended on many factors, including the public profile of the project and the sense of competition that Raphael felt with other artists, most notably Michelangelo. Thus when Leo X commissioned Raphael to design a set of tapestries of the Acts of the Apostles for the Sistine Chapel, both knew that they would be compared with the ceiling of the chapel completed by Michelangelo just a couple of years earlier. As he would have no control over the weaving of the tapestries in Flanders, Raphael therefore devoted an unusual amount of his own time to the execution of the full-size cartoons that served as models for the weavers. The date of the commission is unknown, though it must have post-dated the election of Leo in March 1513, and only two payments to Raphael are recorded for work on the project, on 15 June 1515 and 20 December 1516, the second apparently a final settlement. The seven surviving cartoons have been in the Royal Collection since 1623, and on loan to the Victoria and Albert Museum since 1865.1

This drawing is Raphael’s study for the cartoon of the Conversion of the Proconsul, also known as the Blinding of Elymas (fig. 39). The episode is described in Acts (13: 6–12). The magician Elymas tried to prevent the Roman proconsul Sergius Paulus from hearing the preaching of Paul and Barnabas; Paul struck Elymas blind, and thereby the proconsul was converted. The same subject is depicted in no. 22.

The tapestry includes, to the left (corresponding to the right here, for tapestries were worked from the back, reversing the image), a pillar decorated with sculpture. Some such element must have been planned from the outset, for it returns the proportions of the tapestry to those of the others designed for the side walls of the chapel, and centralises the vanishing point of the perspective, above the right hand of the proconsul. The drawing is elaborately executed with a detailed perspective grid and a combination of metalpoint and brown wash, unlike the simpler pen-and-wash of most of the modelli produced in Raphael’s
workshop; crude touches by another hand can be seen in the pen reinforcement of some outlines. The sheet is not squared for enlargement, and despite its degree of cogitation this may still have been an investigative sheet that combined several elements of the creative process – perspective, draperies, facial expressions – and served as the basis for a more explicit, less suggestive *modello*. The drawing was also subsequently used as the model for an engraving dated 1516 by Agostino Veneziano, corresponding in size and in all details.\(^3\)

What was probably this drawing was seen in Rome in 1688 by Nicodemus Tessin, in the collection of Queen Christina of Sweden.\(^3\) Queen Christina's drawings passed, after her death in 1689, through the hands of Cardinal Decio Azzolino to his nephew Pompeo Azzolino, and thence probably to Livio Odescalchi. After Odescalchi's death in 1713 some of the collection was dispersed, though the majority of the drawings remained together until 1790 when they were sold to the Teyler Museum, Haarlem, where they remain.

The note in Inventory A, ‘This Drawing was bought at Rome’, does imply that it was purchased singly by one of George III’s agents, and not as part of a large collection.

1. For the full history of the tapestries see Shearman 1972; for the documents, Shearman 2003, i, pp. 205, 271–2.
2. Bartsch xiv, p. 43, no. 48.
3. ‘vom Raffael Paulus mit dem Blinden vor dem Keijsser, worbeij diese Wörter geschrieben stunden: L. Sergius Paulus christianem fidem amplecitur Pauli praedicatione’ (Stockholm 1966, p. 449). Despite the small discrepancy in the inscription, this identification is probably secure.
RAPHAEL (RAFFAELLO SANTI)
Urbino 1483–Rome 1520

13. The Three Graces c. 1517–18

Red chalk over some stylus underdrawing
20.3 × 25.8 cm, the corners cut
Verso inscribed with an unidentified paraph
RL 12754
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Around 1517–18 Raphael’s assistants frescoed the vault of the garden loggia of Agostino Chigi’s suburban villa on the banks of the Tiber, now known as the Villa Farnesina. The two main fields and their pendentives depict episodes from the story of Psyche; other scenes in the lunettes were never executed, and the constant threat of flooding from the river seems to have precluded frescoes on the side walls.¹ This is a study for the Three Graces sprinkling a libation over the married couple at the right of the Wedding Feast of Cupid and Psyche (fig. 40), one of two fictive ‘tapestries’ running along the axis of the vault.

The red chalk studies for the project present perhaps the most difficult problem of attribution in the whole of Raphael’s oeuvre. The issue is confused by highly competent drawings by members of the studio, by the existence of good copies after lost originals, and by the workshop practice of taking offsets which, as seen here at upper right, can blur some of the lines of the originals.² Further, there seems to be no difference in function between the life studies attributable to Raphael himself and those by his assistants, implying that Raphael must have been involved in preparing at least some of the scenes at this routine level. The present study, probably from a single model in three consecutive poses, is one of the few studies for the project that have hardly ever been disputed as the work of Raphael himself.³ The draughtsman is fully in control of his medium, taking the drawing as far as necessary and no further, defining highlights simply by leaving areas of paper blank.

But the clear and harmonious light in the drawing became harsh and incoherent in the painting, and a letter from Leonardo Sellaio in Rome to Michelangelo in Florence opined that the frescoes were ‘a disgrace for a great artist’.⁴ Though partisan, Sellaio’s criticism of the frescoes was not unfounded. The coarseness and inconsistency of effect of the frescoes is especially noticeable in the crown of the vault, which would have been executed first; Raphael seems to have become aware of this lapse in quality, for the subsequent pendentives are of a higher standard, suggesting that the master took more control over the execution of the later passages.

Sellaio’s letter is dated 1 January 1518, probably following the Florentine calendar and thus 1519 modern style. This is one of the few documents of the progress of the commission, and suggests that the frescoes were open to view by the end of 1518.

Fig. 40 Workshop of Raphael, The Wedding Feast of Cupid and Psyche; fresco (Villa Farnesina, Rome)

¹ For the frescoes see e.g. Kliemann and Rohlmann 2004, pp. 194–213.
² Offsets from this drawing are to be found at Chatsworth (Jaffé [M.] 1994, no. 311) and in the Uffizi, inv. 1651–Orn. v (Rome 1981, no. 105).
³ For discussions of this problem see especially Shearman 1964 and Oberhuber 1986. The drawing was attributed by Hartt 1944, p. 77, to Gianfrancesco Penni, and by Fischel 1948, pp. 185, 366, to Giulio Romano, ‘with vivifying touches of Raphael’s own hand’. Popham (1949) implied that a lack of stylus underdrawing might be an argument against Raphael’s authorship; such underdrawing is, however, visible around many of the contours, most clearly along the back of the right-hand figure.
ANDREA DEL SARTO (ANDREA D’AGNOLO)
Florence 1486–1530

14. The head of St Sebastian c.1517–18

Black chalk
28.6 × 22.5 cm
Verso: Studies of architectural details and of drapery. Black chalk
RL 3405

PROVENANCE
Possibly Silvestro Bonfiglioli (d. 1696); from whose heirs bought by Zaccaria Sagredo, 1728; from whom bought by Consul Joseph Smith, 1751/2; from whom bought by George III, 1762; Inv. A, p. 80, Guido &c. Tom. 4, among ‘13 heads by Various Scholars of Guido’

REFERENCE
Kurz 1955, no. 739

The drawing is a study by Andrea del Sarto (see nos. 2–3) for the head of St Sebastian, who kneels clutching the arrows of his attempted martyrdom in the left foreground of the Dispute on the Trinity (more accurately a Discourse of St Augustine on the Trinity). The altarpiece was executed probably around 1517–18 for the Augustinian church of San Gallo outside Florence and is now in the Pitti (fig. 41). The drawing is unusually sketchy for a large head by Sarto, but the incisive, sweeping strokes of chalk are exactly his.

Two other drawings for the St Sebastian are known, both in red chalk. In the Uffizi is a study of a nude garzone, thigh-length and wearing a turban, and in a private collection is a hesitant drawing of the upper half of the saint, with his drapery gathered over his right arm as in the painting. Neither of these studies shows the profile turned into the pictorial space as far as in the painting, and the purpose of the present drawing may have been to examine – however roughly – the effect of turning the saint’s head further, so that his locks of hair largely obscure his face.

Sarto reprised the pose of St Sebastian in the apostle in the left foreground of the Panciatichi Assumption of c.1522–3 (also in the Pitti), who kneels in the same attitude but turns his head to look out at the viewer; the apostle there had initially been conceived looking forwards, like St Sebastian (as shown by a study for the figure whose connection with the Assumption rather than with the Dispute is demonstrated by other studies on the verso of that sheet). Sarto also used the same pose for St Nicholas of Bari in the Passerini Assumption of c.1526 and – returning more closely to the semi-nude St Sebastian – for the Baptist in the Gambassi Madonna and Child with Saints (both paintings again in the Pitti) of a couple of years later.

On the verso of the sheet (fig. 42) are several sketches of architectural mouldings, perhaps for the lost original frame for the painting, and an indeterminate drapery study.

The drawing had been mounted for George III among the sheets by followers of Guido Reni. ‘Un Disegno con Testa di Mano d’Andrea del Sarto’ was listed in the 1696 inventory of Silvestro Bonfiglioli, among drawings by Bolognese artists including Guido Reni, Guercino and Ludovico Carracci. This may have been the present sheet, subsequently losing its attribution and being subsumed among the Bolognese drawings that passed to Sagredo and then to Smith.

1 Galleria Palatina, Florence, inv. 172. For the painting and its iconography see Freedberg 1963, no. 40; Shearman 1965, i, no. 51; Florence 1986a, no. xiii; Natali 1999, pp. 89–93.
2 Uffizi, inv. 6918–f; Florence 1986a, no. 23.
3 Goldner 1998.
4 Getty, inv. 84.68.7; Goldner 1988, no. 1; Ottawa 2005, no. 32.
Baldassare Peruzzi
Ancaiano, Tuscany 1481 – Rome 1536

15. A design for an organ case c. 1520

Pen and ink with wash and white heightening on buff paper
56.5 × 38.0 cm
Inscribed by the artist, centre: FIDES / B / & da notare che in questa fascia va in un cane piccole delo organo / & da la lattra dove va in un cane grandi va levato via el collare / segnato B. preterea se po volendo tor via el fastigio ove / quarto tondo santo ali satyri e qui dare la cornice diritta usando / el fastigio superiore. Vlterius se po levare luno e laltro fastigio / e farlo dove vano le canne grandi va levato via el collari/no segnato .B. preterea se po volendo tor via el fastigio / ove / quarto tondo FIDES / B / E da no tare che inquesta faccia vano le canne piccole delo organo / & da laltra

In the upper pediment is the shield of the Gonzaga of Mantua, and in the rounded pediment below is an emblematic device (impresa) depicting Mount Olympus with a road spiralling up its side, topped by an altar (here with a burning offering), and the word FIDES (faith). This device was used by Federico II Gonzaga (1500–1540) after he succeeded his father as Marchese in 1519. The tradition that the Emperor Charles V conferred the device on Federico for his valour during the defence of Pavia against the French in 1522 seems to have no foundation, but when the Emperor created Federico Duke of Mantua in 1530 he allowed him to add the device to the Gonzaga arms.1

Popham noted that in 1522 Baldassare Castiglione bought an alabaster organ in Rome for Isabella d’Este, Federico’s mother. The organ, which was presumably of a portable, table-top design, was sent to Isabella in Mantua and placed in her grotta in the Palazzo Ducale; it may have been the ‘organetto fornito, guasto, cum la cassa’ (‘small decorated organ, broken, with its case’) listed along with other precious objects in the camerino del studio, in the posthumous inventory of Federico’s possessions.2 But the impresa here is specifically that of Federico, not his mother, and it is probable that the drawing – with its note suggesting alternative designs – was made to be sent from Rome to Federico in Mantua, where it could have been executed in wood.3 The date of the design would fall between Federico’s accession as Marchese in 1519 and the arrival in Mantua in 1524 of Giulio Romano, who soon assumed responsibility for the design of all such objects at the Gonzaga court.

There is no scale on the drawing, though the density of decoration suggests that it was to be large. The architecture relates closely to a design by Peruzzi for an altar surround in the Getty (fig. 43),4 the measurements on which give a total height of around 3 m (10 ft), and it may be supposed that the organ was to be about the same size.

Provenance
Royal Collection by c.1770(?) (Inv. A, p. 17 [an inserted loose sheet that predates the rest of the inventory], ‘by Baldassare Peruzzi da Sienna ... the celebrated Drawing for an Organ at Sienna, mention’d by G. Vasari’; also listed on p. 53 [of c.1810], ‘a most capital ornamented Architectural drawing for the Front of an Organ for a Church in his native City of Sienna [Bald: Peruzzi.]’)

References
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 683; Frommel 1968, no. 79; London 1981, no. 187

The nature of Peruzzi’s training in Siena is not known with certainty: Vasari stated that he studied with a goldsmith, but his first documented work is in fresco, and he was active as an architect as early as 1500. By 1503 he was in Rome, working in the Vatican Stanze before Raphael’s arrival, and after 1505 designing and decorating buildings including the Villa Farnesina for Agostino Chigi (see no. 13). He was held hostage during the Sack of 1527, and after being ransomed spent five years back in Siena, where he held the position of city architect.

This large and impressive sheet is a study for an organ case, with Apollo standing at the apex of the design, flanked by four females, presumably Muses, and with other seated Muses in relief against the attic storey below. In niches to the sides of the attached columns are standing allegorical figures, with further niches down the side of the organ. At the centre, where the organ pipes would be, the artist has written:

It is to be noted that the small pipes of the organ are on this side and that, on the other, where the large pipes are, the frieze marked B is left out. Besides, if it is desired, the pediment or quarter-circle underneath the satyrs can be removed and the cornice here left straight, using the upper pediment. Further, both pediments can be removed and it can be made in the form of a triumphal arch.

Fig. 43 Baldassare Peruzzi, A design for an altar, pen and ink with wash, incised, 45.4 × 37.7 cm (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles)

1 For the impresa see Malacarne and Signorini 1996, pp. 104–16.
2 Ferrari 2003, p. 111, no. 1387.
4 Goldner and Hendrix 1992, no. 32.
PERINO DEL VAGA (PIETRO BUONACCORSI)
Florence 1501–Rome 1547

16. St Mark and St John with putti c. 1525

Red chalk over squaring with the stylus
32.7 × 51.2 cm, the lower corners damaged and restored
Inscribed lower right: P ... or R ..., cut; verso, on a reinforcing strip of paper: Jerom

PROVENANCE
Antonio Tronsarelli; Jerome Lanier (his six-pointed star stamp, not in Lugt 1921); probably acquired by Charles II; Royal Collection by c. 1810 (Inv. A, p. 52, Giaio [sic] Romano, Poldierno, e Perino del Vaga, Tom. 2, ‘11. St. Mark & St John ... [Perin. del Vagay’)

REFERENCES
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 974; Roberts 1986, no. 37; Joannides 1996, no. 48; Clayton 1999, no. 50; Mantua 2001, no. 59

In May 1519 the church of San Marcello, on the Corso in Rome, was destroyed by fire. Among the ruins was found an intact wooden crucifix, which was thus held to have miraculous properties and was carried in procession during the plague of 1522. The subsequent abatement of the plague led Cardinal Guglielmo Raimondi di Vich to found the Confraternita del Santissimo Crocifisso, whose first artistic initiative was the decoration of a chapel erected to house the miraculous crucifix as part of the rebuilding of San Marcello.

Perino del Vaga (see no. 4) began work in the chapel at an unknown date, but a lack of funds brought painting to a halt, and on 6 February 1525 the artist signed a new contract with the confraternity. By the time of the Sack, Perino had painted a Creation of Eve in the crown of the vault, and much of the flanking figures of St Mark with his lion and St John with his eagle (fig. 44), as studied here. Work then fell into abeyance until Perino returned to Rome a decade later. A revised contract was signed on 25 April 1539, Perino delegating the work to his assistant Daniele da Volterra, who by May 1543 had completed St John and added the figures of St Matthew and St Luke (to a revised design) on the other side of the Creation of Eve. It is not known whether frescoes were ever planned for the side walls, which remained blank.1

A damaged study in Berlin records Perino’s initial design for the vault, with God the Father in the central field.1 The subsequent substitution of the Creation of Eve may seem an odd choice of subject for a chapel dedicated to the Crucifixion, but St Augustine had seen in the creation of Eve, from the rib taken from Adam’s side, a prefiguration of the blood and water that issued from the wound in Christ’s side on the Cross. The figures of the Evangelists in the Berlin drawing are squared with black chalk, and Perino transferred the poses of the saints to the present sheet by incising it with an equivalent squared grid before beginning work with the chalk. The positions of the Evangelists within the grids do correspond, but Perino here began the figure of St John a square too low, and the two figures are thus out of register.

The process of transcribing the design from one sheet to another exaggerated the linearity of the figures, and St John’s eagle almost merges with his drapery. Nonetheless, Perino was clearly responsive to the solidity of Michelangelo’s prophets, sibyls and ignudi, painted fifteen years earlier in the Sistine Chapel, and we can see how the young artist attempted to reach an accommodation between the apparently conflicting examples of Michelangelo and his one-time master, Raphael.

The drawing was recorded in the collection of the minor Roman nobleman Antonio Tronsarelli, posthumously inventoried in 1601.1 Like no. 24, the drawing bears a six-pointed star and the inscription Jerom on the verso, probably indicating that within a few decades the drawing was in England, in the collection of Jerome Lanier (d. 1657).

**Polidoro da Caravaggio (Polidoro Caldara)**

Caravaggio, Lombardy c.1499 – Messina c.1543

17. *The head of St Thomas (?) c.1527*

Red chalk
20.9 × 26.8 cm
Verso: Tobias and the Angel, and St Andrew. Black chalk and wash

**Provenance**
Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 74, Caracci Tom. 3, among ‘14 Various Studies of Heads of the three Caracci’)

**References**
Wittkower 1952, no. 595; Leone de Castris 2001, no. 2239

The drawing formed part of the Carracci sequence at Windsor, but it is in fact a fine example of a red-chalk life study by Polidoro da Caravaggio (see no. 5), a mode of drawing in which he excelled. The figure bears a nimbus, and looks up with an expression of trepidation; he has the aspect of, for example, St Thomas at the moment at which Christ showed his wound to the incredulous disciple after the Resurrection. Polidoro executed a painting of that subject around 1530 for a chapel dedicated to St Thomas in Messina (now Courtauld Institute Galleries, London), but the saint in that panel is quite different in appearance and is posed in lost profile to the left. Leone de Castris associated the drawing instead with Polidoro’s painting of *Sant’Angelo Crowned by Angels* (private collection, Rome), close in date to the *St Thomas.* The profile is indeed similar, but the saint in that painting tilts his head back to look up at his crown, and it is unlikely that the hesitant face of the figure in this drawing could have been intended for a saint gazing heavenwards.

A date before Polidoro’s Sicilian period is suggested by the studies on the verso of the sheet (fig. 45). The two larger drawings (revealed when the drawing was lifted from its old mount in 2003), of a figure holding what appears to be an X-shaped cross, are probably studies for St Andrew in an altarpiece that Polidoro executed for the fish-merchants in Naples. In 1526 their votive chapel was rebuilt as the church of Santa Maria delle Grazie alla Pescheria, altered many times over the centuries before its demolition as recently as 1968. Shortly after his arrival in Naples in 1527, in flight from the Sack of Rome, Polidoro received the commission to incorporate a miraculous panel of the *Madonna and Child* from the old chapel into a new altarpiece for the church. He initially planned to house the panel within a single-field altarpiece depicting angels supporting the frame of the panel, above souls in purgatory flanked by the patron saints of fishermen, Peter and Andrew (this design is recorded in another drawing at Windsor1). But the altarpiece was executed as an assemblage of smaller panels clustered around the votive Madonna, and all Polidoro’s subsequent studies for the project (including several for St Andrew) treat the elements individually. Some panels were removed at an early date, and on the destruction of the church the remaining parts of the altarpiece were dispersed. The panels of St Peter and St Andrew are now on deposit in Capodimonte, Naples.

The other small study on the verso of the sheet shows *Tobias and the Angel,* a typical Polidoro sketch of small-scale, quirkily proportioned figures but executed in an unusual technique of black chalk and wash. It has not been possible to relate this study to any other work by the artist.

---

2. Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 690; Clayton 1999, no. 62.
SEBASTIANO DEL PIOMBO (SEBASTIANO LUCIANI)
?
Venice 1485/6–Rome 1547

18. The Holy Family with Pope Clement VII c.1530

Black chalk
26.7 × 21.9 cm
Verso: The Christ Child. Black and white chalks on grey prepared paper
Inscribed on the verso: di Fra Bart[olomeo]. [sic] di piombo
RL 4813

PROVENANCE
Nicholas Lanier (his five-pointed star stamp, Lugt 1931, no. 2886); probably acquired by Charles II; Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 45, Mich.: Angelo Buonarroti Tom. II, ‘10. Study for an Altarpiece, Holy Family with St: Francis ... Black Chalk’)

REFERENCES
Berenson 1938, no. 2505a; Dussler 1942, no. 177; Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 923; Joannides 1996, no. 20

Sebastiano Luciani trained in Venice in the circles of Giovanni Bellini and Giorgione, and moved to Rome in 1511 in the company of the banker and patron of the arts Agostino Chigi (see no. 13). He soon became a close associate of Michelangelo, who provided many drawings for Sebastiano’s paintings, and was extensively patronised by Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici, elected Pope Clement VII in 1523. Sebastiano was one of the few artists not to flee Rome after the Sack of 1527, and as a result he became a fixture at the Papal court. In 1531 he was made Keeper of the Papal Seals (hence his epithet ‘del Piombo’), and his artistic output in later years was much reduced.

The drawing seems to be a study towards an unexecuted painting considered around 1530. The muscular Christ Child (drawn three times, including a larger sketch on the verso of the sheet, fig. 47) twists to lean on a globe symbolising dominion over the Earth. His pose recalls the Christ Child in Sebastiano’s earlier tondo of a Madonna and Child (Fitzwilliam),1 of which another echo would be seen later in the infant clutching a dog in Sebastiano’s dismembered Visitation (formerly Santa Maria della Pace, Rome).2 In the principal study here Joseph introduces a kneeling figure identifiable as Clement VII, whom Sebastiano painted and drew many times, always emphasising his prominent nose and cheekbones. Here he is bearded, dating the drawing after the Sack of Rome, when the Pope grew a beard as a sign of penitence. The likeness is particularly close to a drawing in the British Museum of the Pope with the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, which presumably dates from (or shortly after) the winter of 1529–30, when Pope and Emperor met in Bologna.3

Sebastiano travelled in the Pope’s retinue to Bologna, and while there he surely resumed an acquaintance with Parmigianino (see no. 42). The two must have known each other from Parmigianino’s period in Rome in 1524–7, when Parmigianino had presented Clement with three paintings and had subsequently received a commission (unexecuted) to fresco the Sala dei Pontifici of the Vatican. In Bologna, Parmigianino gave the Pope another painting, the Madonna della Rosa (fig. 46). The common title of that painting is somewhat misleading, for although the Christ Child does indeed hold a rose, the more prominent symbol is the terrestrial globe on which he sprawls. Parmigianino’s preparatory drawings show that the globe was a late addition to the iconography, and was presumably introduced when Parmigianino decided to present the work to the Pope. (At the same time, Parmigianino painted an allegorical portrait of the Emperor, also featuring a terrestrial globe – which rather contradicted the message of the Madonna della Rosa, that Christ alone had dominion over the earth.)4 Parmigianino’s painting would surely have been known to Sebastiano, and informed a number of his subsequent works. His response here is primarily iconographic; a drawing by Sebastiano in the Metropolitan Museum of Art recalls the form of Parmigianino’s painting more explicitly, with the Child sprawling on a globe behind which crouches the infant Baptist.5 But the painting closest in spirit (and probably in date) to the present drawing is Sebastiano’s Madonna del Velo in Naples, in which the figure of Joseph bears a striking resemblance to the Pope.6

2 A copy of the composition survives in the Galleria Borghese (Hirst 1981, pl. 102).
3 Pouncey and Gere 1962, no. 279.
5 Hirst 1981, pl. 181.
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*Fig. 46* Parmigianino, Madonna della Rosa; oil on panel, 109.0 × 88.5 cm (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden)

*Fig. 47* No. 18 verso
**Michelangelo Buonarroti**
Caprese, Tuscany 1475–Rome 1564

19. *The Fall of Phaeton* 1533

Black chalk
41.3 × 23.4 cm
Verso: *The bust of a woman*. Red chalk
RL 12766

**Provenance**
Presented by the artist to Tommaso de' Cavalieri; after whose death, 1587, acquired by Cardinal Alessandro Farnese; Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 45, *Mich: Angelo Buonaroti Tom. II*, ‘7. Fall of Phaeton . . . [Black Chalk]’)

**References**
Frey 1909–11, no. 58; Thode 1908–13, iii, no. 542; Berenson 1938, no. 1617; De Tolnay 1948, no. 119; Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 430; Dussler 1959, no. 238; Hartt 1971, no. 358; London 1975, no. 126; De Tolnay 1975–80, no. 343; Hirst 1988, no. 45; Ioannides 1996, no. 9

Michelangelo first met the young Roman nobleman Tommaso de’ Cavalieri in late 1532, and formed an immediate friendship that lasted until the artist’s death. He sent Cavalieri letters and poems, and early in their friendship made four highly finished drawings as gifts. These ‘presentation drawings’ are perhaps the highest achievement of Michelangelo’s graphic output, and rank among the greatest drawings in Western art.

The first drawings that Michelangelo gave to Cavalieri, by 1 January 1533, were a Punishment of Tityus (also at Windsor) and a Rape of Ganymede (probably lost, though a version of high quality in the Fogg Art Museum may be the original). The following summer Michelangelo worked on a third drawing, the Fall of Phaeton, whose receipt Cavalieri acknowledged in a letter of 6 September 1533, writing that he had been visited by the Pope, by Cardinal Ippolito de’ Medici, and by ‘everyone’, all of whom wished to see the drawing. The Cardinal subsequently borrowed the Phaeton and the earlier two drawings to have them reproduced in carved crystals by Giovanni Bernardi da Castel Bolognese. During 1533 Michelangelo also drew the Children’s bacchanal (no. 20) for Cavalieri, and the four presentation drawings were acquired after Cavalieri’s death in 1587 by the great collector Cardinal Alessandro Farnese. The drawings seem to have left the Farnese collections around the middle of the seventeenth century, though as they were so celebrated in their day, reproduced in engravings, drawn copies and other media, it is puzzling that we have no record of their whereabouts until the Tityus was engraved by Francesco Bartolozzi in the Royal Library towards the end of the eighteenth century.

Michelangelo followed Ovid’s account of the story of Phaeton, who begged his father Apollo to be allowed to drive the sun-chariot for a day. But he could not control the quadriga – it careened too high and the earth froze, too low and it was scorched, until the gods pleaded for the intervention of Jupiter, who with a thunderbolt knocked Phaeton from the sky. He plunged into the river Eridanus (represented here by a recumbent river-god), to be mourned by his sisters and his brother Cynicus, who was transformed into a swan. The story is an illustration of the consequences of hubris, and the drawing has been interpreted as an expression of Michelangelo’s feelings of Platonic love for the young Cavalieri, though the subject may simply have been a piece of moral guidance from the mature artist to the 13-year-old youth.

Though the composition is held together by a conventional pyramidal layout with a strong vertical axis, it is formed of three distinct, powerfully modelled figure groups, each of which is set against a separate and much more diffuse background. The effect is deliberately that of relief sculpture, with the figures as if in high relief and the backgrounds in low relief against the plane of the paper. The absence of a defined illusionistic space distils the event to a relentless chain of cause and effect, capturing the inevitability of Ovid’s tale.

Two other black chalk drawings of the subject by Michelangelo survive. A smaller sheet in the British Museum (fig. 48), probably drawn in June 1533, also arranges the composition in three tiers, though it lacks the vertical axis that is so insistent here. A sheet in the Accademia, Venice, is by contrast almost symmetrical, with the plunging figure of Phaeton flanked by two pairs of intertwined horses, and the reclining Eridanus, now at the centre of the lower group, throwing his hands up at the terrible sight falling towards him.

The London drawing bears a note from the artist to Cavalieri, offering to finish it if

Cavalieri likes it, or if not, to draw another version; the Venice version bears a partially illegible message which reads ‘I have drawn it as well as I could; however, I am returning yours to you’. Which drawing Michelangelo meant by ‘yours’ is unclear, but this note might suggest that he essayed both the rigorously symmetrical Venice version and the more laterally spread London version before arriving at the subtleties of the Windsor composition. However, the Venice sheet bears on its verso studies for the Last Judgement, which would seem to date it to c.1534–5, and the more axial composition of that drawing could be seen as a development of the Windsor composition rather than as a sketch rejected as too uncompromising.

1 On the Farnese drawings see e.g. Riebesell 1989, pp. 124–31 (though that account is confused about the autograph status of some of Michelangelo’s drawings).
2 Hirst 1988, nos. 44, 46.
20. **A children’s bacchanal 1533**

Red chalk  
27.4 × 38.8 cm  
RL 12777

**PROVENANCE**

Presented by the artist to Tommaso de’ Cavalieri; after whose death, 1587, acquired by Cardinal Alessandro Farnese; Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 45, *Mich. Angelo Buonaroti Tom. II*, ‘3. Several Boys carrying a dead Monster, One with a Pig; some boiling a Caldron, others in Groupe in the foreground drinking; A female Satyr and two Children; one sucking her lank Breast, the other uncovering an Old Man a Sleep – perhaps the Emblem of Night – the subject very obscure, but the Drawing very Capital … Red Chalk.’)

**REFERENCES**

Frey 1909–11, no. 187; Thode 1908–13, iii, no. 543; Berenson 1938, no. 1618; De Tolnay 1948, no. 120; Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 431; Dussler 1959, no. 165; Hartt 1971, no. 361; London 1975, no. 122; De Tolnay 1975–80, II, no. 338; Hirst 1988, no. 47

Like the *Fall of Phaeton* (no. 19), this drawing was executed by Michelangelo as a gift for Tommaso de’ Cavalieri. Vasari (who knew Michelangelo well) mentioned it last among the four sheets made for Cavalieri in 1532–3, and as some of the figures in the composition were copied by Michelangelo’s Florentine assistant Raffaello da Montelupo,¹ it must have been begun before Michelangelo left Florence for Rome in October 1533. The level of finish is extraordinary, even by Michelangelo’s standards. Working mainly with the sharpened point of the chalk, the artist maintained a consistent level of exquisite workmanship across the whole of the densely figured sheet. The state of preservation of the sheet is almost perfect, except for a little trimming around the edges as shown by early engravings after the drawing.

The scene is a cave or other rocky setting hung with drapery. At upper left, children stir a caldron, while others stoke its fire; beyond hang a hare and the head of a boar, a small boar is borne on a child’s shoulders, and at the centre a group struggle to carry in a deer. At upper right is a wine butt, from which some children drink, while another urinates into a wine bowl that is doubtless to be offered to one of his companions. Below, a man sleeps, apparently under the effect of the wine, while to the left an old satyr-woman suckles a child.

No textual source is known for the imagery, but the meaning is clear. The infants represent the lowest state of humanity, devoid of reason (also denoted by the drunken slumber of the only adult human) and thus acting in a semi-animal manner, made explicit by the satyr-woman. At one level this is a standard Neoplatonic theme; less seriously, it may also be possible to see in the drawing a warning from the austere Michelangelo to the adolescent Cavalieri about the perils of drink.

Many of the motifs are derived from antique sarcophagi of children, of which several were known in the sixteenth century.² While the echoes of Raphael’s *Entombment of 1507* (now Galleria Borghese, Rome; then in San Francesco al Prato, Perugia), in the opposed straining of the central group, may be thought of as generic, the kneeling putto at upper right replicates the complex pose of the holy woman at the lower right of that painting, turned through 90 degrees. This is not a simple quotation: Michelangelo was repaying a compliment, for Raphael had taken his figure from the Virgin in Michelangelo’s *Doni Tondo* (Uffizi), also turning her through 90 degrees. In effect, Michelangelo was here replicating the pose of his own *Doni Virgin*, seen from behind. That Raphael was an intermediary in this transformation is demonstrated by the echoes of the Borghese *Entombment* in a double-sided drawing by Michelangelo in Bayonne. On the recto of that sheet is a *Lamentation* – actually little different in iconography from Raphael’s painting, which is in fact a *Lamentation and carrying of Christ’s body to the tomb* – that quotes Raphael’s composition directly in at least two elements; on the verso is what appears to be a preparatory sketch for the *Children’s bacchanal*, showing a group of putti around (and some climbing into) a large wine vat, with a recumbent male nude immediately to the left.³

1. On a sheet in the Ashmolean, Parker 1956, no. 410.  
2. See e.g. Bober and Rubinstein 1986, p. 91.  
BACCIO BANDINELLI
Gaiole in Chianti 1488 – Florence 1560

21. A head of a man c. 1545

Pen and ink
40.0 × 26.5 cm
Verso: Two male nudes. Pen and ink
Inscribed on the verso by the artist: ... ne Lionarda dona ... figliuola di lorenzo rosso;
and by two other hands, lower edge, red chalk: Bandinelli, and black chalk: ... Bandinelli

PROVENANCE
Royal Collection by c.1770(?) (probably Inv. A, p. 17 [an inserted sheet that pre-dates the rest of the inventory], among '13 by Baccio Bandinelli'; also p. 47 [of c.1810], '17 to 29. Various Studies of Baccio Bandinello')

REFERENCE
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 74v

Bandinelli initially trained as a painter before devoting himself to sculpture, and unlike most sculptors of the sixteenth century he was a prolific draughtsman. As a faithful supporter of the Medici he profited from the patronage of Popes Leo X (Giovanni de' Medici) and Clement VII (Giulio de' Medici), and he attempted to monopolise the commissions for large-scale sculpture in Florence after Cosimo de' Medici was created Grand Duke of Tuscany in 1537. Bandinelli's ambitious and mercurial temperament earned him few friends; indeed, his status as an 'official' artist, coupled with the ponderous nature of much of his sculpture, prompted the contempt of his peers and of succeeding centuries, and he remains one of the most important sixteenth-century artists never to have had a monograph devoted to his art.

Michelangelo was Bandinelli's role model (though the older artist held him in disdain) and his pen technique was conceived in emulation of Michelangelo's, a patchwork of parallel hatching and cross-hatching. While Bandinelli never attained the flexibility and richness of Michelangelo's pen drawings, this is an unusually successful and striking effort, the vigorous hatching with loose curling lines and dense areas of ink juxtaposed with patches of untouched white paper to give a liveliness of effect rarely seen in his drawings.

Bandinelli was one of the most assiduous self-portraitists of the Renaissance, and there has thus been a temptation to identify any bearded man depicted by the artist as Bandinelli himself. His features are readily identifiable, especially his long, slender, sharp nose with undulating profile, and are quite different from those of the sitter here.1 There is none of the idealisation seen in most of Bandinelli's portrait images: the figure wears everyday dress, a collared jacket over a buttoned shirt, and this informalty was no doubt a reflection of the nature of the drawing, a straightforward study of an acquaintance with no rhetorical bombast or aggrandising agenda.

On the other side of the sheet is a study of two male nudes, one resting on a club (fig. 49). Ward noted that similarly posed figures are found in a composition of the Combat of the Gods by Bandinelli, engraved by Beatrizet and published in 1545.2 Bandinelli frequently repeated his poses and it is doubtful whether the drawing was a direct study for that composition; nonetheless, the date of this sheet is probably around that of the Combat.

Fig. 49 No. 21 verso

---

1 For Bandinelli's self-portraits see e.g. Weil-Garris Brandt 1986; Galicka and Sygietyńska 1992; Fiorentini and Rosenberg 2002.
2 Ward 1982, no. 420, and in Detroit 2002, no. 150.
TADDEO ZUCCARO
Sant’Angelo in Vado, Marche 1527–Rome 1566

22. The Conversion of the Proconsul c.1557–9

Pen and ink with white heightening over charcoal, on blue paper
39.2 × 53.0 cm
Inscribed lower centre in a seventeenth-century hand: Taddeo Sucaaro, and in an eighteenth-century hand: zuccaro
Verso: Studies for St Paul and a bystander. Black chalk on blue paper
RL 6016

PROVENANCE
Probably Jerome Lanier (his six-pointed star stamp, not in Lugt 1921), thus probably acquired by Charles II; Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 55, Zucaro Pasarotti e Altri Maestri, among ‘21 to 45. Of Taddeo and Frederico Zucaro, their School, and other Masters in their Stile’)

REFERENCES
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 1067; Gere 1969a, no. 257

As a youth Taddeo Zuccaro travelled from his provincial home near Urbino to Rome. Before his premature death he established himself as the most dynamic painter of decorative schemes in the city, combining rich colour and Michelangelesque grandeur in Mannerist compositions, and his bold drawings outshine those of any contemporary in central Italy.

This is a large sketch for the fresco (fig. 50) painted by Taddeo on the left wall of the Frangipani chapel of San Marcello al Corso in Rome (across the nave from Perino’s Cappella del Crocifisso – see no. 16). According to Vasari, Mario Frangipani commissioned Taddeo to decorate the chapel with scenes from the life of St Paul following the unveiling of his work in the Mattei Chapel of Santa Maria della Consolazione in 1556 (Frangipani was a member of the confraternity of that church). Throughout the project Taddeo was distracted by other

work. He was not able to begin painting in the chapel for a couple of years, and though much of the barrel vault was completed in 1559–60, there was then a hiatus until 1563. The chapel was left incomplete at Taddeo’s death in September 1566, and was finished by his brother Federico.¹

The composition of the painting is very different from the drawing, with the protagonists seen beyond a foreground of gesticulating semi-nude onlookers, and Popham noted that the layout here is actually closer to the fresco of the Healing of the Cripple.

Taddeo’s dissatisfaction with the composition is evident from the fact that he (for it was surely he) tore up the folded sheet after its execution; some member of the workshop presumably retrieved the pieces and restored the sheet. When the drawing was lifted from its mount during recent conservation, further studies were revealed on the verso (fig. 51). Three of these are of St Paul in variants of the pose on the recto – two majestic studies the full height of the paper and a spidery sketch at lower right; the fourth study, at upper right, is of a startled bystander from behind, probably intended for the right foreground of the

Fig. 50 Taddeo Zuccaro, The Conversion of the Proconsul; fresco (San Marcello al Corso, Rome)

Fig. 51 No. 22 verso
composition but not to be found in the frescoes, nor in any of the other numerous preparatory studies for the Frangipani project.

Drawings in Stockholm (by Rubens, copying a lost drawing by Taddeo or re-working such a copy) and Chicago document the evolution from the classical balance of the present design to the Mannerism of the painting. A damaged drawing in the Louvre appears to be a facsimile-type copy of the Windsor drawing; Gere thought that it might be an original study, but it is so close in detail to the present sketch that it would be hard to explain the function of such a sheet. Finally, also at Windsor is a large red chalk drawing, squared for transfer, of which Gere judged that ‘in spite of its suspiciously exact correspondence with the fresco, the drawing is certainly by TZ himself; it must be the modello from which the full-size cartoon was squared’.

1 For the project, including numerous other studies for the paintings, see Gere 1969a, pp. 71–83; Acidini Luchinat 1998–9, i, pp. 59–78; Bailey 2003.
2 Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, inv. 305/1863; Art Institute of Chicago, inv. 1928.196; Gere 1969a, nos. 222 and 22 respectively.
3 Louvre, inv. 44153; Gere 1969a, no. 172; Gere 1969b, no. 16.
4 Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 1068; Gere 1969a, no. 255.
Jan van der Straet was born and trained in Flanders, but he travelled in 1545 to Italy (where he assumed an Italianised or Latinised form of his name) and spent most of the rest of his life in Florence, initially working under Giorgio Vasari (no. 9). As well as practising as a painter, Stradanus provided many designs for tapestries and engravings, remaining one of the most recognisably Flemish of the many northern artists who pursued their careers in Italy.

This is a study for a painting in the Studiolo of Francesco de’ Medici (later Grand Duke of Tuscany), leading off the main chamber (the Sala del Cinquecento) of the Palazzo Vecchio, Florence. Francesco was fascinated by the sciences and natural phenomena, especially the metamorphic sciences such as alchemy, metallurgy and pharmacy, and the Studiolo was designed as a cabinet room to house his collection of small and precious objects, both natural and man-made. The room is lined with paintings following an iconographic programme devised during 1570 by Vasari and the learned Vincenzo Borghini, on the theme of (in the ceiling) the four elements, seasons and humours, and (around the walls) their interactions and transformations.1

The paintings fronting the cabinets are in two tiers, rectangular above and oval below, and in general the many painters who contributed to this scheme were each assigned a pair of vertically adjacent panels. Stradanus’s pair, to the right of centre of the left (Fire) wall, depict an Alchemist’s Laboratory above and Odysseus and Circe (fig. 52) below, each signed and dated IOHANNES STRATENSIS FLANDRUS 1570. Elaborate studies for the two paintings are at Windsor;2 both are rectangular, suggesting that Stradanus devised the compositions at a stage in the planning when it was intended to have two equal tiers of rectangular paintings. The subsequent decision to use an oval format for the lower paintings required Stradanus to modify this composition, compressing it widthways and rearranging the animals.

The subject is taken from Book x of the Odyssey. During their journey home after the Trojan War, Odysseus and his companions landed on the island of the sorceress Circe. At centre right she is shown feeding one of the men with soup drugged with a potion that turned them into pigs; to the left of Circe is a man mid-transformation, on all fours with a pig’s head, while behind a servant feeds the swine. Odysseus set out for Circe’s palace to release the men, protected by a ‘moly root’ given by Mercury (with the winged helmet, in the left foreground beyond Odysseus). The Odyssey mentions only pigs, though the popularity of Giovanni Battista Gelli’s La Circe (1549), ten dialogues between Circe, Odysseus and his transformed companions, ranging from an oyster to an elephant, encouraged the depiction of a variety of animals – here a lion, a bear, a wolf and a fox. In the distance is Penelope, the wife of Odysseus, seated at her loom as she passes the years waiting for his return.

---

1 For the scheme of the Studiolo see Feinberg 2002.
2 The other drawing is White and Crawley 1994, no. 142; Baroni Vannucci 1997, no. 114; Brooks 2003, no. 77.
Alessandro Allori was trained in Florence by his adoptive father, Agnolo Bronzino (no. 7), and after spending 1554 to 1560 in Rome he returned to establish himself as one of the leading painters of late Florentine Mannerism, combining a Counter-Reformation sensibility with the refined pictorial values that he had learnt from Bronzino. Alongside many religious works, Allori's most extensive secular project was the decoration of the Salone Grande of the Villa Medici at Poggio a Caiano near Florence, for which this is a study.

The frescoes had been begun around 1520 at the instigation of Pope Leo X (Giovanni de’ Medici), but only one lunette had been completed by Pontormo, and two frescoes on the side-walls partially executed by Andrea del Sarto and Franciabigio, when work was abandoned at the end of 1521 on the death of the Pope. In 1574 Francesco de’ Medici became Grand Duke of Tuscany on the death of his father Cosimo I. Four years later he commissioned Allori to resume the decoration of the room, following a revised iconographic scheme by Vincenzo Borghini (who had also been responsible for the programme of the Studiolo – see no. 23), and over the next four years Allori completed the frescoes. The artist took pains to harmonise his work with the earlier phase, extending Sarto’s and Franciabigio’s compositions by quoting figures from other works by those artists.1

Allori’s large project drawing survives in the Uffizi.2 It includes, on a damaged part of the sheet, the present allegorical figures (in reverse order) over the entrance door to the Salone, at the centre of one of the long walls. They are Fortitude, with club and lion; Prudence, with her usual attributes of mirror, serpent and double face; and Vigilance, with sun and taper for watching both day and night, and in her cloak the apples of the Hesperides – the subject of Allori’s lunette in the Salone, studied in another drawing at Windsor.3 They bostride a dragon, the globe, and military regalia, symbolising the spiritual and temporal triumph of the Medici. The figural portion of the drawing is squared for transfer but corresponds only approximately with the fresco (fig. 53), where the figures fill out and relax their Mannerist poise, the Medici shield and swags with putti expand (at the expense of the wings of Prudence), and the broken pediment is replaced by a fictive inscribed plaque.

3 Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 58.
GIROLMOMUZIANO
Brescia 1532–Rome 1592

25. St Jerome c. 1580

Red chalk, partly washed over
39.0 × 27.6 cm
RL 0440

PROVENANCE
Presumably Royal Collection by c. 1810 (perhaps Inv. A, p. 54, Pellegrino Tibaldi, Primaticcio, Procaccini &c, among Three Drawings by Muziano & Cangiasi?)

REFERENCES
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 518; Joannides 1996, no. 49

Girolamo Muziano trained as a landscape artist in Padua and Venice, and moved to Rome in 1549; there he gradually assimilated that city’s strain of Michelangelesque Mannerism as seen in the work of artists such as Taddeo Zuccaro (no. 22). The sober, even sombre religious paintings that dominate Muziano’s later production (much of it under the patronage, direct or indirect, of Pope Gregory XIII) reveal little of his Venetian background. But in his fresco cycles for Cardinal Ippolito d’Este, a number of detailed drawings, and a series of engravings by Cornelis Cort to Muziano’s designs, he successfully married a Roman figure style with a Venetian love of deep and complex landscapes.

The drawing is a study for St Jerome in Muziano’s altarpiece of St Jerome Preaching in the Wilderness, also known as the Six Hermit Saints (fig. 54), painted for the Cappella Gregoriana of St Peter’s. Muziano had designed the mosaics for the chapel, executed between 1578 and 1580, and shortly thereafter he began work on two altarpieces (the other depicting the Mass of St Basil). Borghini mentioned in 1584 that the artist had ‘in hand’ two paintings for the chapel, without stating their subjects.1 They were left unfinished at the artist’s death and were completed by Cesare Nebbia and Paul Brill, before being placed against the two outer faces of the great north-east pier of the crossing of St Peter’s.1

Compositional studies for the altarpiece are in the Uffizi and the Louvre,1 and three other studies for the figure of St Jerome are also to be found in the Louvre. One of these is drawn on the same scale as the present sheet and replicates the saint’s pose, but the drapery falls from the right shoulder across the left hip. The facial features and right hand are much clearer than here, which would usually suggest that it was a later refinement, but in fact it seems to be the earliest of the studies. In the later two studies the drapery is more summarily drawn but the sophisticated contrapposto of the painted figure is gradually developed. As Joannides pointed out, the pose is based on that of the prophet Ezekiel in Michelangelo’s Sistine ceiling, but the heavy, broad figural type, with drapery clinging to the surface, depends on Michelangelo’s later visual language as typified by the frescoes in the Cappella Paolina of the 1540s.5

During the 1720s it was decided to replace both paintings with mosaics. In 1723–4 Luigi Vanvitelli made a cartoon after the St Basil, but this was not used; instead, in 1743 Pierre Subleyras was commissioned to paint a new version of the subject, and a mosaic after that painting replaced Muziano’s St Basil, which is now lost but is known from an engraving by Jacques Callot. Muziano’s St Jerome was replaced with a mosaic after Domenichino’s Last Communion of St Jerome (see no. 116), and both Subleyras’s St Basil and Muziano’s St Jerome were transferred to the church of Santa Maria degli Angeli.6

1 Borghini 1584, p. 577.
3 Uffizi, inv. 12810-F (Foclani 1962, no. 84);
Louvre, inv. 5105 (Chicago 1979, no. 31).
4 Louvre, inv. 5109 (Chicago 1979, no. 32;
6 DiFederico 1983, p. 75.

Fig. 54 Girolamo Muziano, Six Hermit Saints; oil on panel (Santa Maria degli Angeli, Rome)
26. **Allegorical figures c. 1580**

Pen and ink with wash and white heightening over black chalk, on blue paper, partly squared in black chalk

22.2 × 40.0 cm

Inscribed by the artist, centre left: *timor domini*, and centre right: *fide*, and by a later hand, lower right: *zucari r.l. 6017*

**PROVENANCE**
Royal Collection by c. 1810 (Inv. A, p. 55, *Zucaro Passarotti e Altri Maestri*, among 21 to 45. Of Taddeo and Federico Zuccaro, their School, and other Masters in their Stile)

**REFERENCE**
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 1047

The drawing is a study for a pair of allegorical figures painted by Federico Zuccaro (see no. 10) in the vault of the Cappella Paolina in the Vatican (fig. 55), designed by Antonio da Sangallo the Younger in 1537. The chapel is best known for the frescoes of the *Conversion of St Paul* and the *Crucifixion of St Peter* painted by Michelangelo in 1542–50, but most of the decoration was completed several decades later, during the papacy of Gregory XIII. Between 1573 and 1575 Lorenzo Sabatini painted three additional wall frescoes in a Michelangelesque style, and after Sabatini’s death in 1577 Federico Zuccaro and his assistants added (in 1580–81 and 1583–5) a further wall fresco and decorated the vault with a stucco framework and frescoes of scenes from the lives of St Peter and St Paul.1

Above each of four triangular scenes in the vault is a pair of figures; the two studied here are found above *Paul and Silas Imprisoned at Philippi*. In the drawing the bearded man is flanked by a winged angel carrying a palm of martyrdom and a chalice with the Host; the woman holds a lapdog and is accompanied by a putto bearing a flaming urn. The identity of these figures was given by the artist in the annotations *timor domini* (‘Fear of the Lord’) to the left, and *fide* (‘Faith’) to the right. In the painting the figures are posed essentially as in the drawing, but the dog has disappeared (as have the lions’ masks on the architecture behind) and the other attributes are swapped over; it would seem that they are both intended simply to represent Faith.

The figures are variants on the *Adam and Eve* in the spandrels of Cornelis Cort’s engraving of 1571 after Federico’s altarpiece of the *Annunciation with the Mass*.2 Those figures are not a feature of the arched altarpiece and were presumably devised by Zuccaro to ‘square up’ the composition for Cort. Nonetheless, it is clear from the attributes and inscriptions that this drawing was a study expressly for the Paolina project, and that Federico here adapted the figures that he had provided for Cort a few years earlier.

---

1 For Federico’s part in the project see Acidini Luchinat 1998–9, ii, pp. 122–6; for the iconography of Federico’s frescoes see Kuntz 1999.

2 Hollstein 1947–, v, p. 44, no. 26; they are also seen in Raphael Sadeler’s copy of 1580 after Cort’s print, Hollstein 1947–, xxii, p. 216, no. 12.
GIOVANNI DE’ VECCHI
Sansepolcro, Tuscany 1536/7—Rome 1615

27. The Mystical Communion of St Catherine c. 1578

Black chalk and pen and ink with pink wash, some brush in red ink, squared in red chalk
29.7 × 21.2 cm
BL 5086

PROVENANCE
Royal Collection by c.1810 (among four volumes of Diversi Maestri Antichi summarily listed on Inv. A, p. 16)

REFERENCES
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 677; Blunt 1971, no. 514

Giovanni de’ Vecchi was born in Tuscany but spent most of his career working in and around Rome. The drawing is a study for his fresco cycle of episodes from the life of St Catherine of Siena, in the Capranica chapel of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome. St Catherine had been buried in that chapel on her death in 1380 (her remains were transferred to the high altar of the church in 1855). Angelo Capranica allowed the Confraternita del Rosario use of the chapel in 1573, though the Capranica family retained their hereditary rights there, and thereafter the chapel was dedicated both to the Madonna del Santissimo Rosario and to St Catherine.

The decoration of the chapel was financed with funds raised during the Jubilee of 1575. The vault would have been worked on first, a rich stucco framework containing fifteen oil paintings of the Mysteries of the Rosary, all but one by Marcello Venusti. Giovanni de’Vecchi seems to have begun the frescoes of scenes from the life of St Catherine on the side-walls in February 1578, with the young Sienese painter Francesco Vanni as his assistant. In July of that year, however, de’Vecchi signed a contract to paint scenes from the Legend of the True Cross in the Oratorio del Santissimo Crocifisso, and the first of those frescoes occupied de’Vecchi until the spring of 1579, when he resumed (or commenced) work in the Minerva. The St Catherine cycle was largely complete by October of the same year. The chapel has been the subject of considerable study since a campaign of restoration of 1979 removed much later overpaint from the frescoes.1

The drawing is a study for the fresco on the right wall at the entrance to the chapel (fig. 56). In the foreground is one of the saint’s many mystical experiences: to the right Fra Raimondo delle Vigne (Catherine’s confessor, who related this episode in his biography of the saint) searches an altar for a Eucharist that had vanished, while Catherine receives this Eucharist from Christ himself. In the distance, the sick gather around Catherine’s body on its bier in the chapel of St Dominic in the Minerva, where she was laid before her burial. At upper left Fra Giovanni Tantucci, a follower of Catherine, descends from a pulpit, having abandoned preaching a panegyric when he could not make himself heard above the crowd.

Although the drawing is closely squared for transfer and most of the details agree with the fresco, the proportions of the painting are considerably taller than those of the drawing. De’Vecchi stretched the composition by raising the group around the altar at centre right with respect to the figure of Christ, and raising still further the distant view of the saint on her bier. This element was also shrunk in size, introducing an extensive middle ground populated with figures not seen in the drawing. Tosini stressed the novelty in Roman art of the period of the vertical, episodic composition,2 but the differences between drawing and painting suggest that this verticality was accidental, a result of de’Vecchi having to reproportion the composition, rather than a deliberate aesthetic choice.

1 See in particular Strinati 1984; Bianchi and Giunta 1988, pp. 32–53; Heideman 1989; Heideman 1993; Tosini 1994, pp. 313–16, who argued that a note attached to another preparatory drawing for the chapel (Uffizi, inv. 7370–v) showed that de’Vecchi was still engaged with the project as late as 1586, amending the iconography. A third drawing for the fresco cycle is also in the Uffizi, inv. 7367–v.
2 Tosini 1994, p. 316.

Fig. 56 Giovanni de’ Vecchi, The Mystical Communion of St Catherine, fresco (Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome)
Paris Nogari
Rome c. 1536–1601

28. The Circumcision c. 1580

Pen and ink with wash and white heightening, over black chalk, on blue paper
41.7 × 24.6 cm
Inscribed at lower centre, pencil: Di Fran: Salviati
BL 0162

Provenance
Presumably Royal Collection by c. 1810 (probably among four volumes of Diversi Maestri Antichi summarily listed in Inv. A, p. 16)

References
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 523; Alasko 1983, no. 28

Paris Nogari was one of the many artists who worked in large teams on papal commissions during the vigorous pontificates of Gregory XIII (1572–85) and Sixtus V (1585–90), though nothing is known about his career before 1575.1 The drawing is a study for Nogari’s painting of the Circumcision (fig. 57) in the church of Santo Spirito in Sassia, Rome,2 in which he adopted many of the devices typical of late Roman Mannerism – half-length figures cut off by the bottom of the frame, the protagonists seen a little from below to enliven the perspectival arrangement, elongated proportions, an interest in exotic costume, and a dramatic use of highlights.

The painting was executed in oils directly on the right wall of a chapel dedicated to the Assumption of the Virgin. The altarpiece of the Assumption is the work of Livio Agresti, and on the left wall, a pendant to Nogari’s painting, is the Birth of the Virgin by Giovanni Battista Lombardelli. The site of the Circumcision on the right wall explains the perspective of the scene, set before a barrel-vaulted chapel seen obliquely from lower right. An inscription formerly in the frieze of the chapel recorded the patronage of the papal secretary Cesare Gloriero and the completion of the decoration of the chapel in 1583.3 Nogari was engaged throughout the early 1580s on decorative schemes in the churches of San Pietro in Vincoli, the Madonna dei Monti and the Trinità dei Monti, and in the Galleria delle Carte Geografiche and Sala Vecchia degli Svizzeri of the Vatican, and it is not known how long before 1583 work on the chapel in Santo Spirito in Sassia had commenced.4

An earlier study by Nogari for the fresco (fig. 58) shows most of the figures already in their final positions, and the candelabrum that relieves the upper half of the painting but is omitted here.
Cigoli received a humanist education in Florence before training as a painter with Alessandro Allori and Santi di Tito. He was one of the foremost artists to reject the excesses of late Mannerism and, drawing on a wide range of precedents, Cigoli created a distinctively Florentine style of rich colour and narrative clarity, avoiding the stolidity of much Counter-Reformation painting elsewhere in Italy.

The drawing is executed in Cigoli’s unmistakeable technique of broad brush in ink and white on dark prepared paper. Popham observed that the style was that of studies for paintings such as his *Supper in the House of Simon* (1592–6; Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome), and suggested that the figures holding trays must be for some feast scene, without stating explicitly that the drawing might have been an early study for the servants holding platters in the foreground of that painting.¹

Chappell proposed instead that the drawing was connected with Cigoli’s two paintings of the Emperor Heraclitus Carrying the Cross into Jerusalem, each dated 1594. One was painted for the Confraternita della Croce, the confraternity of the silk-weavers’ guild, for their altar in San Marco in Florence and still in situ, the other for the convent of Santa Croce in Empoli and destroyed in the Second World War.² The former was commissioned from Cigoli on 7 December 1591, the artist having been chosen from a list of six after a painting by Matteo Veri had been rejected by the confraternity. The contract with Cigoli stated that the painting should follow a drawing that he had already provided (thus dating his work on the design to 1591), and that he was to complete the work within eight months. Cigoli failed to keep to this deadline; a revised agreement was drawn up in April 1593, and the painting was presumably supplied the following year.³

The two compositions are broadly on the same lines, though reversed in direction, and it is likely that the Empoli version was derived from Cigoli’s studies towards the San Marco painting. Figures in a similar attitude to those here appear on the left of a compositional study in the Uffizi,⁴ and in reverse on the right of the painting in San Marco. The object held on a platter by the servant here must thus be the Byzantine Emperor’s peaked hat (as popularised by Pisanello’s medal of John Palaeologus), though in the painting the page holds a more readily identifiable crown.

A near-identical drawing in the Louvre (on grey-blue paper rather than prepared paper) has been claimed as an autograph repetition – or even the original of which the present sheet is a mere ‘replica’ – but is plainly a copy of the present sheet.⁵

¹ A connection with that painting was accepted by Thiem 1977, p. 290, and Viatte 1988, pp. 84–5, and rejected by Forlani 1959, p. 122, Petrioli Tofani 1979, p. 79, and Faranda 1986, p. 128.
³ For the commission see Padoa Rizzo 1989.
⁴ Uffizi, inv. 88644; Chappell 1992, no. 25.
⁵ Louvre, inv. 911; Viatte 1998, no. 140.
THE COURTS OF NORTHERN ITALY
SIXTEENTH CENTURY
Lorenzo Costa
Ferrara c.1460 – Mantua 1535

30. Portrait of a Lady with a Lapdog c.1500–1505

Oil on panel
45.4 × 35.0 cm
RCIN 405762

Provenance
First recorded in Charles II inventory, c.1666–7, Whitehall

References
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Lorenzo Costa spent his career in the Po valley. He was trained by Ercole de' Roberti in Ferrara and worked in nearby Bologna during the 1480s and 1490s for its ruler, Giovanni IV Bentivoglio. In 1504 Giovanni's son, Antonio Galeazzo Bentivoglio, introduced Costa to Isabella d'Este, sister of Alfonso I d'Este, Duke of Ferrara, and wife of Francesco II Gonzaga, Marchese of Mantua. Isabella commissioned Costa to paint an Allegory (c.1505–6) for her Studiolo in the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua. In 1507 Costa succeeded Mantegna as court painter to the Gonzaga in Mantua.

The sitter's dress in this portrait is typical of the fashion of north Italian courts (Milan, Mantua and Ferrara) during the period 1490 to 1506: detachable sleeves, decorated with stripes, are tied to a red dress with long points; her white shift is visible at these joins and at stripes, are tied to a red dress with long detachable sleeves, decorated with transparent silk caps or nets and who have wide, loose sleeves revealing the ample sleeves of the shift beneath. Stripes were fashionable at the turn of the century, as worn by Beatrice d'Este and Doralice Cambiago in Marco Marziale's Circumcision (1500; National Gallery, London). The latter's hair and style of dress is very similar to that shown here. The way in which the girl holds her dog is strongly reminiscent of Cecilia Gallerani's elegant pose caressing an ermine in Leonardo's famous portrait of c.1490 (Czartoryski Museum, Cracow), which Isabella borrowed in 1498 for comparison with portraits by Giovanni Bellini. Costa's fine technique and the use of the dark background show the influence of the Netherlandish paintings he would have been able to study at the Este court at Ferrara. The ground of the painting has an underlayer of green and pink for the skin, through which some of the many fine drawing lines for outlines and features are now discernible. There is no evidence that this portrait formed the right-hand half of a diptych, as has been suggested. There is a version of this portrait in the Sterbini collection, Rome. The autograph variant in the Currier Museum of Art, Manchester, New Hampshire, may record the same sitter at a different date, or a different sitter wearing finer jewellery. Both portraits depict Costa's ideal type of female beauty.

The most interesting proposal for the identity of the sitter, first made by Berenson, is that it depicts Isabella d'Este herself. In 1508 Isabella sent two portraits by Lorenzo Costa, one of herself and one of her daughter, Eleonora, to her husband, Francesco Gonzaga, who was being held captive in Venice. An unattributed portrait of Isabella, thought to be by Costa and probably a version of the present portrait, was given to the English ambassador in 1514, although it does not appear in any subsequent Royal Collection inventories. The present work was not recorded until the reign of Charles II. Isabella was a famous dog-lover and it has been suggested that the dog here is an allegory of fidelity, echoing the motto in Isabella's studiolo, 'bona fé non est mutabile' ('Good faith is unchanging').

The features of the sitter are very different from known portraits of Isabella. It has been suggested that this portrait, or the Manchester variation, could portray her daughter Eleonora, born in 1493. According to a letter, Costa was painting Eleonora in 1508. However, she would be only 11 years old in 1504, too young to be recorded here if on stylistic grounds this portrait is dated around 1500 to 1505. The Gonzaga and Bentivoglio families were closely related by marriage; the portrait may depict one of the other young heiresses of the Bolognese or Mantuan courts.

Although the sitter's identity is still uncertain, the charming elegance of her portrait captures the refined sophistication of the northern Italian courts in this period.

1 Stella Newton advised John Shearman that the costume should be dated to the late 1490s. The author is grateful to Jane Bridgeman for her advice on the dress and jewellery; she suggests a date of c.1500.
2 Besides Leonardo's Portrait of Cecilia Gallerani (Czartoryski Museum, Cracow), with black bead necklace, and Portrait of a Lady, 'La Belle Ferronière' (Louvre), Beatrice d'Este in the Pala Sforzesca (Brera) of the late 1490s is also depicted with detachable sleeves, a lenza and fine necklaces.
3 The material from which the larger black beads are made cannot be identified, although jet has been proposed. The author is grateful to Dora Thornton for her suggestions.
4 Negro and Roio 2001, nos. 44, 54, 54b, 63, and London 1984, pp. 74–5. The Venus has been linked to a document dated 1515, but the drawing in Berlin has a study on the verso for the Marriage of the Virgin dated 1505.
9 See Ferino-Pagden 1994, no. 49, pp. 107–10, who suggests that the Manchester sitter is perhaps older, more dignified and from a higher social rank than this sitter. Negro and Roio 2001, no. 56, propose that the Manchester sitter is younger. The author is very grateful to Kurt Sundstrom for information on the Manchester painting.

10 Berenson 1901, no. 17, and Luzio 1913, pp. 208–9.

11 Luzio 1913, pp. 208–9; Negro and Roio 2001, pp. 125–6; Shearman 1983, pp. 82–4; Francesco’s son Federico must have presented these to a Venetian nobleman, Girolamo Marcello, in whose collection they were seen in 1525 by Marcantonio Michiel (Michiel 2000 edn, p. 54).


8 Infra-red reflectography shows accurate drawing lines indicating brows, eyes, chin and neck. Costa adjusted her right arm so that it was closer to her body. Various indications on her left sleeve and on her right shoulder were not followed. There is an indication of a doorway in the shadow on the right, but this may be the laying in of the shadow. A photograph before the restoration in 1960 shows many curls of hair on both sides of the head, which had been painted over previously worn areas, and were therefore not original. Shearman (1983, p. 8) suggested that the left-hand edge originally had hinges (as a diptych would), but there is no evidence of this and all the edges are original.

9 See Ferino-Pagden 1994, no. 49, pp. 107–10, who suggests that the Manchester sitter is perhaps older, more dignified and from a higher social rank than this sitter. Negro and Roio 2001, no. 56, propose that the Manchester sitter is younger. The author is very grateful to Kurt Sundstrom for information on the Manchester painting.

12 Luzio 1913, pp. 208–9.


14 Letter of 1 October 1508 from Isabella to Costa; Negro and Roio 2001, p. 161.

15 Other proposed candidates are: Lucrezia d’Este, half-sister of Isabella, who married Annibale Bentivoglio in 1487; Laura Bentivoglio, who married Giovanni Gonzaga in 1494 and was being painted by Costa in 1508 (Negro and Roio 2001, p. 127); Violante, daughter of Giovanni II and favourite of Isabella, who is recorded as staying in Mantua in 1504. See Negro and Roio 2001, p. 126; Martineau in London 1981, p. 162.
LUDOVICO MAZZOLINO
Ferrara c.1480–c.1528

31. Warriors (a fragment) c.1522–6
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Mazzolino worked almost all his life in Ferrara, having trained with Ercole de' Roberti and Lorenzo Costa (see no. 30) in Bologna. He received payments from the Este court and produced predominantly small-scale works in a meticulous technique.

This painting is a fragment: the poplar panel must have been cut down in size on all sides; the off-centre grooved channel on the back appears to belong to a larger painting. When the painting was recently conserved the horses galloping away in the distance and more of the figures on the right were uncovered. The painting is usually dated to the early 1520s by comparison with other works by Mazzolino: The Crossing of the Red Sea of 1521 (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin); Christ among the Doctors and The Massacre of the Innocents of c.1521 (both Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome); and Ecce Homo of c.1525 (Staatlichen Kunstsammlungen, Dresden). Comparisons with Mazzolino's other works suggest that the panel would originally have been about twice as high and two or three times as wide, and that this fragment came from about half-way up the left-hand side.

The central soldier is a figure in authority, his helmet decorated with a white plume, his white horse wearing a blue cloth decorated with gold fleur-de-lis. He seems to be accepting what looks like an arrow from the soldier, whose mouth is open with emotion. He is accompanied by two exotic figures, one turbaned and one veiled. Venturi and Zamboni thought that this was part of a Crucifixion, Shearman that it was part of a Way to Calvary. It is possible, however, that the fragment illustrates another story, taken from the Legend of the True Cross. The lance with which the Centurion (St Longinus) pierced Christ's side was venerated at Jerusalem, until that city was occupied in the seventh century by the Persian King Chosroes II. The point of the lance was then broken off and taken to Constantinople, and much later, in 1244, sold by Baldwin II of Constantinople to Louis IX of France, who took it to Paris. The rest of the lance was given to Pope Innocent VIII in 1492 and is preserved in St Peter's, Rome. If the 'arrow' is a tip of a lance, then it may represent a scene from this story, perhaps when Louis acquired the sacred relic from Baldwin II. Louis IX – St Louis (1214–70) – was revered as the ideal Christian monarch who undertook the Seventh and Eighth Crusades. He was frequently shown, as here, in blue with his emblem, the fleur-de-lis. If this is the subject intended here, then it would fit with the upsurge of interest in the Crusades and in tales of Christian knights in Ferrara at this time. It was at the court of Ferrara that Matteo Maria Boiardo (1441–94) wrote Orlando innamorato in 1482 or 1483 (see no. 42); Ludovico Ariosto (1474–1533) took up the theme with Orlando furioso, first published in 1516 and revised in 1521, which was set against the backdrop of Charlemagne's campaigns against the Saracens. Later in the century, in 1581, Torquato Tasso published his Gerusalemme liberata in Ferrara, telling of the siege of Jerusalem. An inscription on Mazzolino's Tribute Money (Muzeum Narodowe, Poznań) celebrates the achievements of Gerolamo Casio, who had travelled to the Holy Land. This type of subject matter seems to be unique in Mazzolino's work.

The exotic costumes in this piece can also be found in Cesare Vecellio's De gli habitu antichi, et moderni di diversi parti del mondo published in Venice in 1590 and 1598: the turban resembles one worn by Vecellio's illustration of an Egyptian rather than by a Turk. Mazzolino used similar turbans to suggest the exotic, often Jewish or Old Testament figures in his biblical scenes, such as the Pietà (1512), Christ among the Doctors (c.1521) and The Massacre of the Innocents (1519–20; all in the Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome), and his Crossing of the Red Sea (1521; National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin).

Recent conservation has revealed the meticulous delineation of the trappings of the soldiers, the use of gold both decorating the armour and suggesting the fall of light, as on the back of the most central soldier in the foreground. The use of gold was a typical trait of Ferrarese artists, others being Costa and Garofalo. Mazzolino was influenced by the strong miniature tradition at the court of Ferrara, which had produced the famous Bible of Borso d'Este of 1455–61 (Biblioteca Estense, Modena). His contemporaries Amico Aspertini and Ercole de' Roberti worked with similarly fine lines and high finish. Mazzolino's vitality of line and interest in the grotesque probably derived from northern prints, especially those by Düer, who was in Ferrara in 1506. The energy and focused gazes of the horseman reveal a debt to Leonardo's famous lost masterpiece, The Battle of Anghiari.
DOSSO DOSSI (GIOVANNI DI NICCOLÒ DE LUTERO)

?Ferrara c.1490 – Ferrara c.1541–2

32. The Holy Family c.1527–8

Oil on canvas
169.7 × 172.7 cm
RCIN 402853

PROVENANCE
Palazzo Ducale, Mantua, 1627 inventory (610); acquired by Charles I; valued at £80 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to Proctor in November 1649; recovered at the Restoration

REFERENCES
Shearman 1983, no. 81; Humfrey in New York 1999b, no. 37

Giovanni de Lutero’s family owned property at Villa Dossi, near Mantua, from which he derived his name. According to Vasari, he was trained by Lorenzo Costa but it is hard to see a link between the two artists. His first documented work was for Francesco Gonzaga II in Mantua in 1512, but by the following year he had settled in Ferrara where he was the leading court artist for the rest of his life, first for Alfonso d’Este and then for his son Ercole II.

This painting was first identified as by Dosso by Van der Doort in 1639, an attribution which has never since been disputed, although Peter Humfrey has suggested that Dosso’s brother Battista may have contributed to the landscape.1 It can be dated to c.1527–8 by comparison with Dosso’s Sts John the Evangelist and Bartholomew with Pontificina della Salle and another man (Palazzo Barberini, Rome) and his destroyed Immaculate Conception with the Fathers of the Church (originally in the Duomo, Modena), both of c.1527.

The commission for this Holy Family probably came from the ruling Mantuan family, the Gonzaga, as it first appears in the inventory of the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua in 1627. It was not unheard of for an artist at the court of Ferrara to work for the nearby court of Mantua; there was a friendly rivalry between Alfonso d’Este and his sister Isabella, who married Francesco II Gonzaga, Marchese of Mantua, in 1490. In 1519 Dosso and Titian were allowed to study Isabella’s collection in the Castello in Mantua on behalf of Alfonso; in 1523 Isabella was interested in a view of Ferrara by Dosso in her brother’s collection, which she wished to have copied.2 The commission for no. 32 may have come from Isabella or her son, Federico.

There is some uncertainty about the subject of the painting, although it probably depicts the Holy Family with the Virgin’s parents, St Joachim and St Anne.3 The cockerel so firmly grasped by the Christ Child alludes to his Resurrection and the reawakening of the world under the new dispensation, as the cock crow to mark the dawn of a new day.4 The Virgin Mary points to her son, while St Anne raises her hand in recognition. The red and white lilies allude to the purity of the Virgin; the small white flower seen growing in the foreground, possibly a strawberry flower, is also an emblem of the Virgin.

Dosso planned his composition directly onto the grey prepared layer of the canvas without the use of preliminary drawings. The many changes that he made while painting are now partially visible. Infra-red reflectography and x-radiography reveal further changes below the present surface in the central figure group, whose arrangement was tightened and intensified. Initially, the Virgin wore a fuller green and blue robe with elaborate bunched folds extending further to the left, and with a tumble of drapery towards the bottom right, extending in the foreground, possibly a strawberry flower, is also an emblem of the Virgin.

The various elements in this painting – the elaborately arranged hair of the Virgin, the texture and pattern of her rich clothes, the tethered cockerel and the flowers spread out in the foreground – are acutely observed, as if directly from nature. But the natural world is poetically interpreted, with layers of meaning alluded to rather than fully explained, just as the participants in the painting seem to understand the meaning of Christ to different degrees. The use of light as a symbol of the new dawn of the Resurrection occurs throughout, made more poetic because Christ’s head is hidden in shadow while only his halo gleams, caught in the fitful light cast from the sunburst above. Angels’ heads are hidden in dark storm-clouds and the distant landscape is illuminated with dramatic contrasts of sunlight and shadow, almost like summer lightning. This effect is reminiscent of Giorgione’s famously poetic and enigmatic landscape La Tempesta (Accademia, Venice). The other Venetian painter who strongly influenced Dosso was Titian; here the free brushwork, intense colours and dramatic placing of bright yellow foliage against a dark sky derive from similar effects in Titian’s Andrians (Prado), which was delivered to Ferrara in 1523 or 1524.5 These rich effects of dense foliage and flickering light may also reflect the impact of northern art – the prints of Düer, Altdorfer and Huber and the atmospheric landscapes of Netherlandish artists, such as Patinir, which were popular in the court of Ferrara at this time.6 The pyramidal composition with balanced and interlinked poses, the sharp contrasts of light and shadow and the scale of the work may be Dosso’s response to Giulio Romano, who arrived in Mantua in 1524, and can be compared to his Madonna della Perla (fig. 7) and Madonna della Gatta (fig. 59).7 It has also been suggested that the refined handling of the paint and the elegant figures reflect the influence of Parmigianino (compare nos. 36–7 and 42), which would mean that it must date from soon after Parmigianino’s arrival in Bologna in 1527.8

2 Luzio 1913, p. 26, note 2; Ballarin 1994, i, pp. 142–3.
3 The 1627 Mantuan inventory describes the two males as Peter and Paul; if this is accurate, then the cock must be St Peter’s emblem: see Gibbons 1965, pp. 493–9; Gibbons 1968, pp. 103–8. Shearman rules out this suggestion on the grounds that neither saint is wearing St Peter’s usual colours of yellow and blue.
4 Humfrey (New York 1999b, p. 202) argues that the nearer of the two is Joseph, wearing the same colours that Joseph wears in other paintings by Dosso, his Rest on the Flight into Egypt (Uffizi) and Nativity (Galleria Borghese, Rome), and Battista Dosso’s Holy Family with the Infant Baptist (Ackland Art Museum, University of North Carolina). Shearman suggests that the subject was the meeting of the two Holy Families, the Virgin Mary and Joseph being accompanied by Elizabeth and Zachariah, the parents of John the Baptist, although
he admits that the absence of John the Baptist would be unusual. For other ingenious interpretations see Gibbons 1968 and Del Bravo 1994, p. 79.

4 Shearman cites Cristoforo Marcello, *Dialogi de animae sanitate*, 1518, as a contemporary text linking the cock with the Resurrection.

5 The painting was conserved in 1971 by John Brearley; for Dosso’s technique see Rothe and Carr in New York 1999b, pp. 55–64.


9 Humfrey (1998) points out that Dosso’s *Music of c. 1530* (Galleria Estense, Modena) has a similar coiffure.
GAROFALO (BENVENUTO TISI)
Ferrara c.1476–1559

33. The Holy Family 1533

Oil on panel
42.5 × 55.4 cm
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Benvenuto Tisi is known as ‘Il Garofalo’ after the small town near Ferrara where his family originated. He trained with Boccaccio Boccaccino and was influenced by Domenico Panetti, Lorenzo Costa and Lodovico Mazzolino. He spent his entire career in Ferrara, executing altarpieces and small devotional paintings for the Ferrarese nobility, including the ruling Este family.

Unusually, this painting bears on the back an inscription which may be translated ‘this was finished on 2 May 1533’, which appears to have been written at the time and is certainly consistent with the apparent date of the painting. The veiled old woman here is probably St Anne (the Virgin’s mother). It is unlikely to be St Elizabeth (although elsewhere Garofalo painted her in this costume) because of the absence of her son, John the Baptist. St Anne’s gesture links the written word being read by the Virgin with its embodiment, the Christ Child, who unusually bears the marks of the Cross on his hands and feet, and has one foot on a stone slab. The wounds clearly foretell the Child’s Passion on the Cross; the stone refers to the stone of his future tomb.

The painting was conserved for this exhibition. The remarkable preservation of the brilliant, jewel-like colours is a testament to Garofalo’s careful preparation and skilful technique. A brushed grey imprimatura was applied over the ground, creating a fine diagonal texture visible in the Virgin’s face and giving the paint layers, particularly the whites, their cool, luminous clarity. The use of rich glazes over subtly modulated opaque paint layers gives depth and saturation of colour. Like Mazzolino and Costa, Garofalo often used shell or powdered gold to decorate details: surviving touches of gold around the head of the Virgin suggest that originally each figure had a golden halo. Also typical of Garofalo’s Ferrarese training is the almost miniaturist detail of the folds of the cloth, the serrated edge of the Virgin’s blue mantle and the depiction of relief decoration on the cradle.

The horizontal format, architectural setting and airy landscape are typical of Garofalo’s works of this date, and can be compared to his Madonna in Glory with St Francis and St Anthony of Padua (Pinacoteca Capitolina, Rome) of the early 1530s. The brilliant yellow and green of the sunlit foliage stand out against the snow-capped mountains, which dissolve into the blue of the sky. This colour combination and the deft free touches of the brush betray the influence of Dosso Dossi’s virtuoso painting technique, which can be seen in his slightly earlier Holy Family (no. 32). Both artists must have learned from the precise and fantastical landscapes of German artists such as Cranach, Altdorfer and Huber.

Garofalo also shows an awareness of the Roman style of painting, which was beginning to be imported into the northern Italian courts at this date. Garofalo visited Rome in 1512, where he came into contact with Raphael and studied the antique. The Doric columns on the right echo some ancient fragments found near the Quirinal Hill in Rome and recorded there in a Renaissance collection of drawings after the antique, the Codex Coner (Sir John Soane’s Museum, London, fol. 119). The baluster on the Virgin’s reading desk is similar to the decoration of the throne of Jupiter, a Roman statue then visible in Rome and now housed in the Museo Nazionale, Naples. The ‘antique-style’ cradle reveals Garofalo’s awareness of Raphael’s work, in particular a group of paintings of the Holy Family around a rocking cradle, designed by Raphael in c.1518–19 and executed by his assistants Giulio Romano and Giovanni Francesco Penni. A crucial work in this respect is the Madonna della Gatta (Madonna with the Cat, fig. 59), thought to be by Giulio Romano and datable to the early 1520s, which was described by Vasari as being in the Gonzaga collection in nearby Mantua. In 1524 Giulio himself arrived in Mantua from Rome. Many elements here show Garofalo responding to his rival’s style: the dark architectural setting before which the figures are caught in sharp chiaroscuro; the sturdy figure of Christ; the sculptural folds; and the contrast between the ideal, classical features of the Virgin and the older face of her mother.

1 Letter in Royal Collection picture files from Philip Pouncey dated 21 September 1946:izzo meant maggio not mazo in Venetian dialect.
2 Other representations in Garofalo’s work of Sts Anne and Elizabeth are: Holy Family with St John the Baptist, Elizabeth, Zacharias and Francis (National Gallery, London); Holy Family with St John the Baptist and St Elizabeth (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna); Holy Family with St Joachim and St Anne (Doria Pamphilj, Rome); Holy Family with St Joachim, St Anne, St Elizabeth, and St John the Baptist (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden); Fioravanti Baraldi 1993, nos. 94, 95, 96, 163.
3 Christ steps onto a rock in Holy Family with St John the Baptist, St Anne and St Joachim (Pinacoteca Capitolina, Rome) and Holy Family with St John the Baptist and St Elizabeth (Museo Civico, Padua); Fioravanti Baraldi 1993, nos. 68, 98.
4 Work carried out by Karen Ashworth.
5 Grey or grey-brown primings consisting of lead white, black and earth pigments are typical of Garofalo and his contemporaries; Joseph’s orange.
The connection was first noted by Shearman (1983, p. 111); see Bober and Rubinstein 1986, pp. 51–2, no. 1.

Holy Family of St Francis (Louvre), dated 1518; Holy Family (Louvre); Madonna della Quercia (Prado), Madonna del Divino Amore (Capodimonte, Naples); Madonna della Perla (Prado), Madonna della Gatta (Capodimonte, Naples).

For the close links between the Ferrarese and Mantuan courts at this date see no. 32.


Antonio Allegri, called Correggio after his place of birth, a small town near Reggio Emilia, was the most important High Renaissance master working on the mainland of northern Italy. He was based for most of his career in Parma, where his style fused local influences with those of Mantegna, Leonardo da Vinci, and later Raphael and Michelangelo, to create a new dramatic and emotional intensity that foreshadowed the expressive achievements of Baroque art.

This altarpiece is an early work probably made soon after Correggio left his home town of Correggio to settle in Parma, where he executed a cycle of frescoes in the Camera di San Paolo in 1518–19. It probably dates from shortly after the closely related Holy Family with the Infant Baptist (Musée des Beaux Arts, Orléans; fig. 60) of c.1518–19 and before his Rest on the Flight into Egypt (Uffizi) of 1520. It is likely that this painting was known to Parmigianino, who was in Parma until 1524, because he twice borrowed the idea of the left-hand saint – seen in profile, closer to the viewer than the other figures and cut off by the frame – for his Mystic Marriage of St Catherine of 1526 (National Gallery, London) and Virgin and Child with Sts John the Baptist, Mary Magdalene and Zacharias of c.1530–33 (Uffizi).

The Virgin and Child, with Joseph on the right, all gaze at the figure on the left, presumably St Jerome, who is blessed by the Christ Child. This and St Catherine Reading (no. 35), both small devotional works, are the two that remain of the eight works by Correggio originally owned by Charles I. The Holy Family with the Infant Baptist mentioned above was also in Charles’s collection. In his 1627–8 negotiations with the Gonzaga on behalf of the King, Daniel Nys mentioned a ‘Madonna of Correggio with a head of St Joseph’, which has been connected with this painting but could as well refer to the Royal Collection picture. The present painting has a Charles I brand; it is not in Van der Doort’s inventory, probably because it was at Greenwich, for which he made only summary notes and where it was appraised at £50 in September 1649.

Correggio is known to have reused preparatory drawings or repeated ideas from earlier compositions. The group of the Virgin, Joseph and the Christ Child repeat the group in the Orléans Holy Family (fig. 60), although in that work they are gazing towards a figure of the young John the Baptist. The two heads of the Virgin are so close that they may derive from the same cartoon. Technical analysis of the two paintings revealed no visible underdrawing in the Orléans picture and only slight changes through x-ray, the most significant being a landscape on the left. The Royal Collection painting has traces of underdrawing and one pentiment. The freer brushwork, less precise delineation of forms and treatment of landscape suggest that the Royal Collection painting was the second of the two. The fact that St Jerome, who here supplants St John, was painted more thinly suggests that he may have been treated separately and added later. The Christ Child here seems unusually serious and vulnerable; though protected by his mother’s hands, he blesses the aged figure of St Jerome with gravity and authority. His figure repeats the similarly vulnerable child in the Virgin and Child with Infant Baptist (Prado). Christ’s tiny hand giving a blessing contrasts with Jerome’s much larger accepting hand, his golden curls with St Jerome’s white hair. The sweetness and intimacy between the figures, particularly the tender but sculptural group of the Virgin and Child, recalls Raphael, who had already explored the grouping of the Holy Family many times in Florence and Rome. Correggio’s study of Raphael is disputed but it is usually thought that he visited Rome at about this time (c.1518–19), although the evidence is only circumstantial. If he did, he would have had the opportunity to study Raphael’s recent work.

This comparison draws attention to the haphazard style of composition and strange, unsettling mood often found in Correggio’s work, quite different from Raphael’s classical rigour. This sense of mystery suggests that the strongest influence here is one shared by Correggio and Raphael alike, namely that of Leonardo da Vinci. The veiled expressions, the softness of skin and hair, the interest in the dynamic relationship between the participants reflect Leonardo’s influence, as do the closed vista and shrouding darkness, thick with foliage.

1. The dating of Correggio’s early works is difficult; see Shearman (1983, pp. 78–9) and Ekserdjian (1997, pp. 68–70).
3. The 1649 Commonwealth Sale inventory describes the saint as St Jerome (Millar 1972a, p. 64), an identification that was disputed by Berenson and Thode, in favour of St James; see Shearman 1983.
6. Christ’s left knee was higher. The author is grateful to Raphaëlle Drouhin (Orléans).
Correggio used the grey ground to give a cool, soft translucency to the skin, with the pink on grey turning to purple for the shadows. Warmth is given by the bright touches of vermilion on the lips and nostril and touches of brown in the corners of the eyes. Typical of Correggio’s late style are the unnaturally large eyes, the horizontally shaped rather than curved eyebrows, the delicate ear and the round, soft hands with boneless fingers. St Catherine’s features link the painting to Correggio’s late series of mythologies (c.1530) depicting Jupiter’s loves: this same pearly softness is seen in the female faces of his Danaë (Galleria Borghese, Rome), the Jupiter and Io (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and his Leda and the Swan (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin).

Vasari singled out the lovely colour and exquisite finish of Correggio’s painting of hair, ‘with each single hair visible … they seemed like gold and more beautiful than real hair’. A blue silk band is wound through plaits of soft, fine hair around St Catherine’s head, in an arrangement that resembles that of Io and Danaë. The cuff of her chemise around her right hand is a rare passage of liveliness in this quiet image, and recalls the chemise on the same saint in Correggio’s earlier Madonna of St Jerome (‘Il Giorno’; Galleria Nazionale, Parma).

The idea of representing St Catherine half-length, resting on a wheel and holding a martyr’s palm, can be found also in the work of north Italian painters such as Cesare de Sesto (an example by his workshop in the Galleria Borghese), Garofalo (National Gallery, London), Dossi Dossi (a painting attributed to him in the Galleria Borghese, which is especially close to Correggio’s image) and Lorenzo Lotto (National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.). A similar painting by Leonardo’s pupil Bernardino Luini (c.1480–1532) in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, also shows the saint reading a book. This suggests that Correggio’s mysterious image may ultimately derive from a composition created or inspired by Leonardo.
PARMI\GIANINO (GIROLAMO FRANCESCO MARIA MAZZOLA)
Parma 1503–Casalmaggiore, Lombardy 1540

36. Portrait of a Young Nobleman c.1530–32

Oil on poplar panel
98.5 × 82.4 cm
RCIN 406025

PROVENANCE
First recorded in the Charles II inventory, c.1666–7, Whitehall
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Girolamo Francesco Maria Mazzola is known as Parmigianino after his birthplace. His early career was inspired by the example of Correggio, who was in Parma by 1518, and whom he worked alongside on the decoration of the church of San Giovanni Evangelista. Parmigianino was in Rome from 1524 until the Sack of 1527, when he went to Bologna; in 1530 he returned to his native city, where the last decade of his life was dominated by a commission to decorate Santa Maria della Steccata.

There is some consensus among scholars in dating this portrait to Parmigianino’s Bolognese period, 1527–30: the composition has at various times been compared to The Mystic Marriage of St Catherine of c.1525–6 (National Gallery, London), the handling of the paint and face to features in the Virgin and Child with St Margaret, St Jerome, St Benedict and an Angel of c.1528–9 (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna) and the Virgin and Child with Sts John the Baptist, Mary Magdalene and Zachariah of c.1530–33 (Uffizi).1 Copertini, however, suggested a later dating, likening the face to that of St Stephen in the Virgin and Child with St Stephen, St John the Baptist and a Donor of c.1539–40 (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden).2 The sitter has short hair, which was fashionable from the 1530s. He wears a travelling cloak over a black silk jerkin with a white linen shirt (camicia). The bulk of the cloak contrasts with the delicate ties of his chemise collar and the decorative detailing around the cuffs.

The painting has been recently conserved.3 It is made up of two pieces of poplar wood secured by two battens at the back, with a vertical join to the right of centre. The left and bottom edges have been trimmed; the two known copies, at Knole House, Kent, and in the Hamilton collection, Glasgow, show slightly more at the bottom edge and all of the sitter’s right hand.4 While the face is highly finished, some of the folds of the sitter’s travelling cloak, particularly at the lower edge, are thinly sketched. The background is barely suggested in places; the architecture behind the sitter is especially difficult to read. The painting may be unfinished, although other works by Parmigianino, such as the Portrait of a Young Woman (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and the famous Madonna of the Long Neck (Uffizi), have areas executed in a similarly summary fashion.5 The cool grey of Parmigianino’s final layer was overpainted in brown by another hand, perhaps as early as the sixteenth century, possibly with the intention of disguising the fact that the painting was unfinished, or of concealing worn areas. It was decided during recent conservation that this brown toning layer could not be removed without compromising the original paint layer.

Typical of Parmigianino are the refined finish of the face, the subtle modelling of the flesh using cool greys for areas in shadow, and the definition of the white collar in full and half-light, caught with a few accurate strokes. The setting of the head against a low horizontal was a device favoured by the artist as early as c.1523, in his Portrait of a Collector (National Gallery, London) and later in his Portrait of a Man, so-called ‘Malatesta Baglione’ of c.1535–8 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna). In the Royal Collection painting the door frame anchors the man’s figure, which is set at an unnervingly distorted angle to us. His head is turned slightly to one side, his shoulders are at different heights and his right arm is pushed towards us without clearly defining the space between viewer and sitter. The restricted colour range, with a dominance of blacks and greys encouraging the viewer to focus on the sitter’s pale face caught in an intense light, give the portrait an air of tension and melancholic introspection.6

The influence of the portraits of the Florentines Bronzino, Pontormo and Rosso Fiorentino is evident, but Shearman was surely correct when he compared the counterbalanced asymmetries with those found in Parmigianino’s St Rock (San Petronio, Bologna) and his Conversion of St Paul (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna). The relation of head to shoulders and outstretched right arm and the cropped locks of hair recall the antique sculpture Amor Stringing a Bow (Pinacoteca Capitolina, Rome), which has been considered a source for Parmigianino’s Cupid Carving his Bow of c.1530–34 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna).7 Parmigianino may have seen the version of the sculpture in Rome, or possibly that in the Grimani collection, Venice; he may have travelled to Venice in 1530, but many antique sources seen in Rome have been traced in both his paintings and drawings.8 For example, the tight folds of the sleeve in the current painting, and the way in which the sitter wears his cloak, have been likened to a toga. It is tempting to suggest that the artist was inspired by antique art in general when he portrayed this young man, even if no specific source can now be traced.

2 Copertini 1932, 1, p. 213; see also Fagiolo dell’Arco 1970, p. 273.
3 This conservation was undertaken by Claire Chorley.
4 The painting had been cleaned previously in 1901 and 1946; it was revarnished in 1955 and treated in 1972. The Hamilton collection copy is attributed to Jervas the Elder in the 1704 inventory and currently hangs in the Palace of Holyroodhouse; see Shearman 1983, pp. 182–3. The Knole version is inscribed Young man of ye Strozzi family.
6 See Freeberg 1950, pp. 115–16.
8 It cannot be established whether the Venetian version of this antique sculpture was in the collection of Cardinal Domenico Grimani (1461–1523), in which case it could have been known by the artist, or whether it was added later by his nephew, Giovanni Grimani (1500–93). See also Ekserdjian 2001, pp. 42–50.
PALLAS ATHENE c.1531–8

Oil on canvas
64.0 × 45.4 cm
Inscribed on the plaque: ATHENE
RCIN 405765

PROVENANCE
Probably Baiardo collection before 1561, acquired from the Reynst collection, Amsterdam, by the States of Holland and West Friesland and presented to Charles II, 1660
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Shearman 1983, no. 186; Vaccaro 2002, no. 33; Ekserdjian in Parma 2003, pp. 228–9

The subject is identified by the inscription ATHENE at the lower edge of the cameo inset into the breastplate, above which is the image of Victory, with palm and olive branch, flying over a city, presumably Athens.1 Pallas Athene was a warrior, usually shown in armour, as well as being the goddess of wisdom and patron of the city that bears her name. The olive branch is here to remind us that she was elected because the Athenians preferred her gift of an olive tree to the horse offered by Poseidon; the Victory is to remind us of the many triumphs brought through her protection.

This painting is almost certainly the ‘head and chest of Minerva’ by Parmigianino measuring 16 by 10 oncia (roughly 72 × 45 cm) in the 1561 inventory of Francesco Baiardo’s collection.2 If so, the present canvas is missing 8 cm from the height; the engraving by Cornelis Visscher gives more space above Athena’s head measuring 16 by 10 oncia large (72 × 45 cm); see also Freedberg 1950, pp. 226, 240; Gould 1976, pp. 160–61, 186, no. 61, who corrected Shearman (1983, pp. 185–6) on the measurements. The painting of the same size cited in the Muselli collection at Verona in 1662 must be a copy, since the Royal Collection painting was already in Amsterdam by 1660.

Shearman and Gould date this painting too late, comparing the drapery (like ‘folded sheet-metal’) and the extreme degree of abstraction of forms with those in the Virgin and Child, with Sts Stephen, John the Baptist and a Donor (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden) of c.1539–40. Athene’s folds are less stylised and more textured than this description implies, and her flesh is more softly realised than the ‘porcelain’ figures of the artist’s very last years.

The ideal of female beauty in Parmigianino’s work has been linked to the poetry of Petrarch. The poet Andrea Baiardo, father of Francesco, elaborated on Petrarchan descriptive conventions.3 In the figure of Pallas Athene naturalism is distorted and stylised to create a Manerist ideal of beauty. But like all Renaissance artists Parmigianino looked at antique sources. This figure may be linked to classical sculpted busts such as the Athena from the Grimani collection, now in the Museo Archaeologico, Venice.4

This painting is now unanimously accepted by Parmigianino and from the final decade of his short career.5 The highly refined style and exaggerated length of Athene’s neck have been likened to the Madonna of the Long Neck (Uffizi) of c.1534–9. He owned other secular and mythological paintings by Parmigianino, such as a Lucretia (perhaps the painting in the Capodimonte, Naples), Saturn and Philyra (private collection, New York), a Mercury (now lost) and Cupid Carving his Bow (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna).6

There is a preparatory drawing of the whole figure in the Morgan Library, New York (fig. 61) and five studies for the plaque and its supporting figures (formerly Spector collection, New York), in one of which Parmigianino explored the idea of a seated Athene.7 X-radiography reveals that the eyes of the principal figure were originally painted more open, rather than looking downwards, and with the gaze directed to the left, as they appear in the Morgan Library drawing. There were originally more folds of drapery under the hand and the thumb was slightly lower.8 Infra-red reflectography also reveals an original design, in the underdrawing, which is closer to the Morgan Library sketch. Parmigianino’s skin tones here were created by thin, transparent glazes laid over vivid pink; as the glaze wears thinner or becomes more transparent with age, so the flesh appears hotter than originally intended.

This painting is now unanimously accepted by Parmigianino and from the final decade of his short career. The highly refined style and exaggerated length of Athene’s neck have been likened to the Madonna of the Long Neck. The sophisticated bravura of the handling of paint to depict jewels and glinting metal ornaments can also be seen in the vessels and paraphernalia surrounding the Three Wise Virgins and Three Foolish Virgins in frescoes painted by Parmigianino in the vault of Santa Maria della Steccata, Parma, in c.1531–9.

Athene has the same elegant proportions as the women in these works, and she is a softer version of the half-length Lucretia of c.1535–6.9 If anything, Shearman and Gould date this painting too late, comparing the drapery (like ‘folded sheet-metal’) and the extreme degree of abstraction of forms with those in the Virgin and Child, with Sts Stephen, John the Baptist and a Donor (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden) of c.1539–40. Athene’s folds are less stylised and more textured than this description implies, and her flesh is more softly realised than the ‘porcelain’ figures of the artist’s very last years.

1 Ovid, Metamorphoses, vii. 79–82; Jameson (1842, i, p. 254, no. 102) discussed the iconography.
2 ‘Una testa col petto d’una Minerva colorita finita alta oncia’ 16 larga 10 di mano il Parmesanino, published in Popham 1971, i, pp. 264–5; see also Freedberg 1950, pp. 226, 240; Gould 1976, pp. 160–61, 186, no. 61, who corrected Shearman (1983, pp. 185–6) on the measurements. The painting of the same size cited in the Muselli collection at Verona in 1662 must be a copy, since the Royal Collection painting was already in Amsterdam by 1660.
5 Popham 1971, i, nos. 316, 799. No. 799 (b) shows Athena seated.
6 There are several lines in paint working out the shoulder line on the left, but not necessarily raising it up as Shearman believed; the right shoulder was lower in the underdrawing.
8 Béguin 2000, p. 19. Scholars have dated the Pallas Athene to various years between 1530 and 1540.
10 Traversari 1973, no. 16; Favoretto and Traversari 1993, fig. 10.

Fig. 61 Parmigianino, Study for the figure of Athene, red chalk, 11.2 × 8.2 cm (Pierpont Morgan Library, New York)
GIULIO ROMANO (GIULIO PIPPI)
Rome c.1499–Mantua 1546

38. **Portrait of Margherita Paleologo c.1531**

Oil on panel

115.5 × 90.0 cm

**PROVENANCE**
Gerard Reynst, Amsterdam; acquired by the States of Holland and West Friesland for presentation to Charles II, 1660; recorded in his c.1666–7 inventory as by Raphael

**REFERENCES**
Shearman 1983, no. 116; Martineau in London 1981, no. 110; Castagnoli and Lorenzoni 1989

Giulio Pippi, called Giulio Romano after his place of birth, entered the workshop of Raphael (nos. 1, 12–13) around 1516 and soon became his principal assistant. After Raphael’s death Giulio completed several of his master’s projects in Rome, before entering the service of Federico Gonzaga (cf. no. 15), 5th Marchese and 1st Duke of Mantua, in 1524. Among many other projects in Mantua he was responsible for the building and decoration of the Palazzo Te and parts of the Palazzo Ducale.

This portrait depicts a fashionable noblewoman in a black overdress decorated with gold thread and worn over a pale crimson underdress, and on her head an elaborate zazara (headdress).1 In the room behind her, a maid-servant greets three visitors: two fashionable ladies and a nun. P.J. Mariette first recognised this as the work of Giulio Romano in 1857–8, and the attribution has been generally accepted since then.2 The composition has been compared to that of Joanna of Aragon of c.1518 (Louvre), painted by Giulio on behalf of Raphael. A similar use of a mysteriously lit background space, in which the next episode in an ambiguous story is preparing to happen, may be seen in the Virgin and Child (Galleria Barberini, Rome) and the Madonna della Gatta (Museo di Capodimonte, Naples; see fig. 59).3 Vasari complained that Giulio used black excessively, a pigment that can be detected in the background here.4 There is a study attributed to Giulio in pen and wash for the figure in the Louvre of the woman drawing back the curtain.

Mariette proposed that the sitter was Isabella d’Este (1474–1539), daughter of Ercole d’Este, Duke of Ferrara; she married Francesco Gonzaga, Marchese of Mantua, in 1490 (see no. 30). If this is the case, Giulio Romano presumably painted the portrait after his arrival at Mantua in 1524 and before Isabella’s departure for Rome in 1525.5 However, it has been suggested more recently that the portrait may depict Isabella’s daughter-in-law, Margherita Paleologo (1510–66), at the time of her marriage to Federico Gonzaga, 1st Duke of Mantua, in 1531.6 There is evidence to connect the costume worn here with Isabella d’Este or her circle, which would support either identification. The peculiar pattern of the dress, known as the ‘knot-fantasies’ (fantasie dei vinci), also decorates the sleeves of Titian’s famous portrait of Isabella d’Este (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and the headdress in Rubens’s copy of c.1530 (in the same museum) of another (lost) Titian portrait of Isabella.7 The pattern was invented by the humanist Niccolò di Correggio in about 1493, probably specifically for Isabella and her sister Beatrice, wife of the Duke of Milan. From correspondence between the two sisters in 1493 we learn that Isabella had not yet adopted the fantasie dei vinci, but that Beatrice was planning a dress decorated with the device to wear to the imperial wedding of her niece, Bianca Sforza, to Emperor Maximilian.8 By the date of this portrait this fashion had become more widespread in north Italian courts. The headdress (zazara) was also a fashion promoted by Isabella.9 The necklace resembles one in a Giulio Romano pen and ink drawing of c.1532–5 (Victoria and Albert Museum), made up of cut curving tubes and knotted looped cloths, though similar necklaces are worn in Bronzino’s Portrait of a Lady in Red (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt; fig. 34) of c.1532–5 and Titian’s Eleonora Gonzaga della Rovere (Uffizi) of c.1536–7.10 The sitter holds a rare and heavy lapis lazuli rosary with gold paternostri (the larger beads) and a devotional image (targa) partially visible at the lower edge of the painting.11 The Gonzagas’ passion for lapis was well known: several lapis rosaries are recorded in the 1540–42 inventory of Federico Gonzaga, and one appears in Titian’s portrait of him (Prado). We know that Federico sent a corona di lapis to his young bride Margherita Paleologo, who is described in a letter of 1531 wearing this and a zazara.12 In Margherita’s inventory there appears a lapis rosary with sixty-three Ave Marie beads interspersed with nine gold paternostri beads, and a targa of St Catherine.13 Since the folds of the dress cover some of the stones it is impossible to establish that this is the rosary in the painting.

Evidently the costume and accessories here could belong equally well to the Duke of Mantua’s mother (Isabella d’Este) in 1524 or to his wife (Margherita Paleologo) in 1531. The sitter here appears to be in her twenties and is certainly too young to be an accurate portrayal of Isabella in her fiftieth year (in 1524). By this time Isabella, who was particularly concerned with her image, refused to give sittings and required artists to base their likenesses of her on previous portraits.14 Titian’s famous image of her as a young and beautiful girl (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) was delivered in 1536, when she was, in reality, in her sixties. Titian worked from (and obviously improved upon) existing portraits; so much so that Isabella wrote of it: ‘we doubt whether, at the age at which he represents us, we were as beautiful as the picture.’15 This portrait may have been attempting something similar.16

---

Image: Portrait Medal of Margherita Paleologo; cast lead, 6.6 cm
(British Museum, London)
However, the features here are not close enough to images of Isabella at any age to make the identification more than a possibility.17

The other candidate, Margherita Paleologo, was 21 when she married Federico in 1531. She was described (in 1530) as having white skin, a long face and a nose like her father’s.18 The only reliable likeness of her is a medal by Pastorino de’ Pastorini dated 1561 (fig. 62), which shows a comparable shape of face, although a slightly different-shaped nose.19 The door frames in the background are very like those that still exist in the Camerini del Sole and delle Cappe, prepared for Margherita and Federico on their marriage, and are very different from those of Isabella’s own rooms on the ground floor of the Castello.20 In 1530 Giulio and Isabella furnished the rooms and in the Camera delle Arme arranged portraits of Federico, leaving a space for ‘the large painting of the Duchess.21

Martineau suggested that the visitors could be Isabella herself, accompanied by Isabella of Capua, the younger woman; and Margherita Cantelma, Duchess of Sora (d. 1532), who moved to a convent in Mantua after the death of her husband and sons. The evidence is not conclusive, but taking into account the medal, the circumstances of the marriage of Margherita at the date of the portrait and the architectural features of the rooms prepared for her, it is Margherita who is most likely to be represented here. LW/AL

1 The underdress was originally a pale crimson colour, as revealed by a strip at the lower edge covered by the frame. Jane Bridgeman dates the headdress c.1525–32.
3 Joannides 1985, pp. 17–46.
4 Vasari 1666–87 edn, v, p. 60.
5 Hartt 1958; Shearman 1983.
7 Castagna and Lorenzoni 1989, p. 25, note 24; Luzio and Renier 1890, pp. 382–8; Luzio and Renier 1896, pp. 451, 462. Leonardo da Vinci also took up the motif, probably liking the pun on his own name (Kemp 1981, pp. 186–7).
8 Castagna and Lorenzoni 1989, pp. 114–15, 23 (j). The authors are grateful to Dora Thornton for advice on the jewellery in the painting.
9 Luzio (1913, p. 227) records letters of 1509 and 1512 in which ladies beg Isabella to permit them to use a copy of her invention; see also Hartt 1958, i, pp. 82–3.
10 Giulio is known to have designed jewellery for Isabella in about 1526, replacing pieces melted down in 1516; see also London 1980, pp. 114–15, 23 (j).
11 Venturelli 2002, p. 176. This rosary is not identical to that in Rubens’s portrait of Isabella (Vienna), as Shearman claimed (1983, p. 120).
16 For a discussion of the issues surrounding feminine portraiture at this date, see Cropper 1986; Kolsky 1984, pp. 47–62; Beer 1990, pp. 161–73.
17 Surviving images of Isabella d’Este: miniature as a child; anonymous Ferrarese manuscript illumination of c.1476 (Biblioteca Estense, Modena, Genealogia dei Principi d’Este, ms. Membr. l.5.16 Ital. 720, carta 30); medal commemorating her marriage in 1490 (Hill 1930, no. 239); medal by Giancristoforo Romano of 1498 (London 1981, no. 109); Leonardo chalk drawing in the Louvre and a copy in the Ashmolean (London 1981, no. 108); Titian portrait of c.1530, lost but two copies: Rubens (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and private collection, Paris; Wethey 1969–75, ii, p. 197, l.11; Ferino-Pagden 1994, pp. 114–17; Titian portrait of 1536 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; Wethey 2002, ii, no. 27; Washington 1990, no. 25).
19 Attwood 2003, p. 451, 462. Leonardo da Vinci also took up the motif, probably liking the pun on his own name (Kemp 1981, pp. 186–7).
20 See Paccagnini 1969, fig. 48; Castagna and Lorenzoni 1989, p. 23.
WORKSHOP OF GIULIO ROMANO (GIULIO PIPPI)
Rome c.1499 – Mantua 1546

39. The Cabinet of the Caesars c.1536–9

i. The Omen of Claudius’s
Imperial Power
Oil on panel
121.4 × 93.5 cm
RCIN 402806

ii. Nero Playing while Rome Burns
Oil on panel
121.5 × 106.7 cm
RCIN 402576

iii. The Sacrifice of a Goat to Jupiter
Oil on panel
123.0 × 66.2 cm
RCIN 406166

iv. An Emperor on Horseback
Oil on panel
86.9 × 49.5 cm
RCIN 404729

v. An Emperor on Horseback
Oil on panel
87.0 × 50.5 cm
RCIN 404730

PROVENANCE
(i–iii): Gabinetto dei Cesari, Palazzo Ducale, Mantua;
1627 Mantuan inventory; acquired by Charles I; (i) and (ii) hung in the Long Gallery at Whitehall; (iii) in Second Privy Lodging Room at Whitehall; (iv) and (v): Gabinetto dei Cesari, Palazzo Ducale, Mantua;
1627 Mantuan inventory; acquired by Charles I; seven such panels were hung with seven of Titian’s Emperors in the Gallery at St James’s; eleven panels were valued at £100 by the Trustees for Sale and bought by Grynder in October 1651; Richard Symonds saw them, still together, with ‘Mr Grynder the Upholsterer’ in London c.1653; two only were recovered at the Restoration. All have Charles I brand on the back

REFERENCES
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Zeitz 2000, pp. 65–103; Mantua 2002, nos. 2–5

Giulio Romano was asked, between 1536 and 1539, to create a series of state apartments within the Palazzo Ducale, Mantua, known as the Appartamento di Troia (‘Troy Apartments’) after the subject illustrated in the most important room. The five paintings exhibited here were part of the elaborate decorative scheme for the Camerino dei Cesari (‘Cabinet of the Caesars’), a room designed to display the eleven canvases of Roman emperors commissioned from Titian in 1536 and completed just before Federico’s death in June 1540.1 This series, one of Titian’s most famous works, was destroyed by fire in Spain in 1734. Although obliged to obtain likenesses from antique medals and sculpted portraits and to follow a formulaic idea of half-lengths in armour holding batons of command, Titian managed to convey the effect of portraits taken from life and impressive Imperial power. The source for the room was The Twelve Caesars (De Vita Caesariam) of Suetonius, but for reasons of space (there was a window wall) Titian supplied eleven, rather than the canonical twelve. The series began with Julius Caesar on the left of the north wall and ended with Titus on the west wall. Domitian, the final Emperor in the series, was supplied by Giulio rather than Titian (see no. 39.iii), and possibly hung in the adjoining room, the Camerino dei Falconi.2

Giulio also provided the ensemble into which these ‘portraits’ fitted. The ceiling frescoes, partially retrieved, could allude to the power of the gods who govern the destinies of men. Titian’s eleven canvases were then framed by decorative stucco and niches containing statuettes. The five works included here come from the painted wooden panels which formed a dado or basamento beneath. Each of Titian’s emperors had a scene from his life illustrated below him – of the original eleven (twelve histories, but Vespasian and Titus were combined in one) only four have survived, three shown here (nos. 39.i–iii) and the Triumph of Vespasian and Titus (Louvre). Flanking these scenes were mounted figures representing the emperors, and one female figure with a horse representing Victory. There were probably twelve of these figures, of which nine survive: three in Marseilles, two at Narford Hall, one at the Trafalgar Galleries, London, one at Christ Church, Oxford, and the two included here (nos. 39.iv and v).3 The ensemble of three walls (omitting the west wall) is recorded by drawings attributed to Ippolito Andreasi, c.1568 (Museum Kunst Palast, Düsseldorf; fig. 64), commissioned by the antiquarian Jacopo Strada. The relationship between the grand Titian figures and Giulio’s narrative scenes below has been compared to the hierarchy of an altarpiece: the predella with anecdotal scenes from the life of the saint who is depicted above, standing in majesty. Giulio’s skill lay in the illusionistic ensemble, bringing together architecture, painting and sculpture, designed to complement Titian’s work.

The subject matter reflects Federico’s obsession with Imperial themes. In 1530 he had received the title of Duke from Emperor Charles V, who had visited Mantua in 1530 and 1532. In November 1536 he received the large territory of Monferrato in Piedmont from the Emperor as a consequence of his marriage to Margherita Paleologo (see no. 38). The episodes depicted may have been selected from Suetonius’s lives of the Caesars by the Cremonese humanist Benedetto Lampridio, appointed tutor to the young Francesco Gonzaga in April 1536, who also supplied Giulio with the stories for the other rooms in the Troy Apartments.4

These panels are the work of Giulio’s studio, which he organised on the principles he had learned as an assistant working for Raphael. The process began with the master creating a drawing. According to Vasari, Giulio ‘always expressed his concepts better in drawings than in finished works or paintings, since in the former we see more vivacity, boldness and execution’.1 The inventiveness of Giulio’s designs is apparent in the way in which the poses of the Roman emperors vary, like those of the Titian portraits above, and the inventive way in which figures are conceived to fit awkward spaces. Most of Giulio’s surviving drawings for this room are squared up so that the designs could be enlarged to the size of full-scale cartoons, from which they could be transferred onto the primed panel. Vasari describes how assistants executed paintings based on Giulio’s great cartoons, which the master then retouched himself. Vasari’s account is confirmed by the underdrawing visible in the five panels shown here, which has the
39.i The Omen of Claudius's Imperial Power

39.ii Nero Playing while Rome Burns
39.iii The Sacrifice of a Goat to Jupiter

39.iv An Emperor on Horseback

39.v An Emperor on Horseback
schematic and meticulous quality of an assistant transferring a design from a cartoon.

Documents from Mantua and sources such as Vasari provide a long list of names of painting assistants. Vasari implies that Giulio allowed them little scope for initiative and was highly controlling. The underdrawing on these panels varies, suggesting that different assistants executed the transferring process and probably then completed the figures. The lively, rather clumsy drawing for the figures in the *Omen of Claudius* seems to match the similar effect in paint. Landscape specialists probably added trees and vegetation, which again varies in style from panel to panel. The architecture is highly accomplished in the *Omen of Claudius’s Imperial Power* (no. 39.i) and *Nero Playing while Rome Burns* (no. 39.ii) and must have been by a different hand from the rather ungainly figures. A still-life specialist added fruit and vegetables in the right foreground of the Claudius scene.

Most scholars have described the panels as poorly prepared and hurriedly executed. They are made up of substantial planks of pine, of good quality but crudely smoothed off, with knots extracted and filled where necessary; the ground is laid with broad, thickly applied brushstrokes, plied in different directions. The final layers of paint have in general been carefully executed. The Camerino dei Cesari was probably dismantled by Ferdinando Gonzaga at the beginning of the seventeenth century and the paintings rearranged in the Loggia Serata. Daniel Nys must have acquired the entire group for Charles I in 1627–8.

The *Omen of Claudius’s Imperial Power* (no. 39.i) was painted to hang beneath Titian’s Claudius on the east wall of the Cabinet of Caesars. The subject is taken from Suetonius’s *Twelve Caesars* (v, 7): Claudius, created a consul by his nephew the Emperor Gaius, received an omen of his future greatness, ‘as an eagle that was flying by lit upon his shoulder’. The eagle was the symbol of Imperial Rome, and also appeared on the coat of arms of the Gonzaga family, which is presumably why this incident was chosen and why the eagle here has its wings outstretched in such a heraldic fashion. Claudius’s profile no doubt derives from an antique medal. The panel seems to have been painted by at least two artists, possibly three, the architectural specialist more competent than the figure painter. The main figures and the essential lines of the architecture have been outlined carefully in the underdrawing, while the still life of fruit and vegetables to the right, the statues and almost all the figures in the background were added freely in paint without...
Claudius and his military escorts, all dressed all'antica, contrast with the spectators in the background who are dressed in contemporary costume. The palace, with its giant Doric pilasters and columns, rustication and statues in niches, is reminiscent of the Palazzo Te, particularly its east façade, towards the fishponds.

_Nero Playing while Rome Burns (no. 39.ii)_ originally hung beneath Titian’s painting of Nero in the centre of the south wall of the Gabinetto dei Cesari. Suetonius (The Twelve Caesars, vi, 38) describes the episode:

Pretending to be disgusted by the drab old buildings … [Nero] brazenly set fire to the city … This terror lasted for six days and seven nights, causing many people to take shelter in monuments and tombs … Nero watched the conflagration from the Tower of Maecenas, enraptured by what he called ‘the beauty of the flames’; then put on his tragedian’s costume and sang _The Sack of Ilium_ from beginning to end.7

Nero is seated in the Septizonium, a building on the Palatine now destroyed, identified in the sixteenth century as the Tower of Maecenas. The Arch of Constantine, the Pantheon and the Colosseum are all visible in the background, though brought together in an arbitrary fashion. All the figures and the architecture of the background are painted skilfully without underdrawing (apart from the obelisk) and it is possible that Giulio contributed this part himself. He knew this part of the Roman Forum, having studied the ruins with care. The fire must have been influenced by the group of 120 Flemish paintings acquired by Federico in 1535, amongst which were twenty representations of fires.8 There is no mention in Suetonius’s text of Nero playing a musical instrument (as opposed to just singing), but here Giulio has added a lute in place of the ancient epic poet’s instrument of choice, the lyre. Rather as Titian’s emperors were based on antique prototypes, so here Nero’s profile must have been derived from an antique coin. The refugees from the fire in the foreground derive
from the scene of the Deluge from Michelangelo’s Sistine Chapel ceiling, which has the same arrangement of figures climbing upwards, cut off at the legs, carrying bundles and baskets, and seeking the apparent safety of high ground. The ‘mother-of-pearl’ flesh painting of these figures led Shearman to suggest that the artist may have been an assistant of Correggio who stayed at Mantua after his master’s death in 1534.

The Sacrifice of a Goat to Jupiter (no. 39.iii) should have been placed below the Emperor Domitian, but his portrait could not be accommodated in the room, so this scene went below Titian’s Titus. For the space below Titian’s Vespasian, Giulio created his Triumph of Vespasian and Titus (Louvre), so that all twelve emperors could be alluded to in the room. The narrow format of this panel probably reflects the tightness of the space available.

The niche with its arabesques and circles here imitates the decoration of the real niches which alternated with Titian’s emperors.

According to Suetonius (The Twelve Caesars, xi, 14), the Emperor Domitian was haunted by predictions of death; he was prevented from at least one act of cruelty by a poem which prophesied that he would be sacrificed like a goat if he carried it out. Here one Vestal tends the altar fire, beneath a statue of Jupiter, while another prepares to sacrifice the goat, with a child to collect the blood.

The top and bottom edges of this panel appear to be original, but the exposed wormholes on the left and right edges suggest that they have been cut and some of the niche appears to have been lost to the right. There is extensive fluid underdrawing, visible in infra-red: the beard of Jupiter is more worked in underdrawing than in final paint; the architecture was not underdrawn at all, but worked out in the paint with incisions for guidance.

A pen and ink preparatory drawing (National Gallery of Art, Washington dc; fig. 65) shows the three lower figures in a wider composition, which presumably had to be narrowed. In the underdrawing the folds of the drapery at the feet of the woman tending the fire are drawn in and over the kneeling child as Giulio and his assistant tightened the space. The underlayers in this panel are darker than in the others in the series, and have become more visible over time.

The two panels with horsemen (no. 39.iv and v) come from the set which framed the scenes from the lives of the emperors (see above for a description of this decorative scheme). It is likely that they represent the emperors, rather than Roman soldiers or attendants. Early sources and inventories, including Jacopo Strada, the Gonzaga inventory of 1627, Van der Doort’s list of 1659 and Symonds c.1653.

Fig. 66 Giulio Romano (?), The Emperor Claudius; oil on panel, 83.0 × 54.0 cm (Trafalgar Galleries, London)

Fig. 67 Infra-red reflectogram of no. 39.v
identify them as emperors or ‘Caesars’. Andreasi’s drawn copies show that many of the figures had symbols of rule or triumph, such as batons or laurel wreaths. He also recorded commemorative plaques, probably originally in stucco, above and below each figure on horseback, many of which name the emperors themselves, as in the case of the inscription Claudius Caesar Audem above the recently discovered panel (Trafalgar Galleries, London; fig. 66), or members of their immediate family.9 There were probably twelve in number, but the lack of an Andreasi drawing for the west wall makes this difficult to establish. According to Andreasi’s drawing (fig. 64), no. 39.iv was to the right of The Funeral of Otho, and he does resemble the Titian likeness above (fig. 63). No. 39.v was originally on the west wall, not recorded by Andreasi, but resembles the almost bald middle-aged head of Vespasian.

Both of these fairly crudely prepared pine panels show distinctive characteristics of technique and underdrawing, suggesting that each is by a different artist in Giulio’s workshop. Under infra-red examination, no. 39.v shows a refined, confident and detailed underdrawing (fig. 67), which although probably based on a cartoon, is not as laboured or mechanical as in other workshop panels (such as the Omen of Claudius). Even small details such as the horse’s and Emperor’s kneecaps, and the shadows cast by the hooves, are delineated. No. 39.iv has less detectable underdrawing, more delicate in execution, but with fewer details. Both artists pay more attention to the drawing of the heads of the horses than those of the emperors. There are also noticeable differences in the painted execution of each picture, suggesting that the artist who drew completed the execution of the painting in paint. The foliage in no. 39.iv is more carefully depicted, whilst the artist of no. 39.v has spent more time on the detail of the ornaments on the bridle and saddle which, like the gold decoration at the rider’s neck, are shown with glittering highlights. His head is damaged so that the dark pupil of his eye is lost.

1 Wethey 1969–75, iii, i-12; Zeitz 2000, pp. 65–103.
3 It is impossible to be certain of the original number of equestrian scenes; see Shearman 1981, p. 124.
4 A letter from Giulio Romano of 13 June 1538 to Federico Gonzaga mentions that he is waiting for Lampridio to give him stories for the paintings in the Hall of Troy; Talvacchia 1988, pp. 235–42.
5 Vasari 1906 edn, v, pp. 528–9.
6 See Keith 2003, pp. 38–49. It is thought that The Triumph of Vespasian and Titus was painted by Giulio himself because it is of such high quality.
9 Cohen (R. and A.) 2000, pp. 16–19; Zeitz 2000, pp. 85–7. The authors are grateful to Guido Robecchini for sharing his research and to Ronald and Alfred Cohen for their assistance with this entry.
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GIULIO ROMANO (GIULIO PIPPI)
Rome c.1499 – Mantua 1546

40. *The Triumphal Feast of Scipio* c.1532

Pen and ink over black chalk, the outlines indented with a stylus and the verso rubbed with black chalk 37.4 × 54.8 cm, the upper corners cut
Inscribed lower left, pen and ink: *Julio Romano*  
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This is a study for one of a series of twenty-two tapestries of scenes from the life of the Roman general Scipio Africanus. Twelve of these tapestries (usually referred to as the *Deeds*) depict episodes from the battles of Scipio against the Carthaginian forces during the Second Punic War. The designs were prepared for an unknown patron by Giulio Romano (see no. 38) in collaboration with Gianfrancesco Penni. This was possibly around 1528, when Penni (also a former assistant of Raphael) moved to Mantua to work briefly alongside Giulio, but more probably during the early 1530s when both were still in Rome. The project ground to a halt before the King of France, Francis I, commissioned the resumption of the project in 1532, whereupon the series was enlarged to include a further ten scenes depicting a triumphal procession of Scipio (known as the *Triumphs*). All of the preparatory drawings for the *Triumphs*, including this sheet, are by Giulio himself. The tapestries were complete by 1535, and remained in the French royal collection until 1797, when they were burnt for their silver and gold threads. The compositions are known from finished *modelli* and subsequent copies, from contemporary prints, and from later tapestries woven from the same cartoons.¹

The present scene is the last of the *Triumphs*, depicting the feast held by Scipio at the Capitol at the end of the triumphal procession. Scipio is seated with his back to the viewer, at the head of the left table; in the tapestry he is identified by a laurel wreath, a feature also seen in an etching of the composition by Antonio Fantuzzi, dated 1543.² The huge candelabrum to the right breaks the pictorial monotony of a large number of figures at a long table, and acts as a counterweight to direct attention towards Scipio.³ Giulio was little concerned with the archaeological accuracy seen in the reconstruction of a Roman banquet made for Cassiano dal Pozzo a century later (no. 129), but a peculiar if trivial connection between the two drawings is seen in the crouching dog with a bone, seen at lower centre here and at the centre of Cassiano’s drawing.

By blackening the verso of the sheet and going over the outlines with a stylus, Giulio transferred the poses of all the figures (except the child seated on the candelabrum) to a *modello* for the composition at Chantilly (fig. 68), in which he added an architectural setting and more background figures.⁴ Giulio did not himself paint the cartoons, which seem to have been prepared in Brussels on the basis of the *modelli* sent from Italy. Unlike Raphael’s designs for the Sistine Chapel cycle (no. 12), Giulio’s drawings are in the direction of the tapestries, and the two surviving full-size cartoons for the series are thus in reverse to the corresponding *modelli*.⁵

---

2. Bartsch xvi, p. 349, no. 28.
3. For the candelabrum see Biscontin 1994.
5. In the Louvre and the Hermitage; Paris 1978, sub no. xv, and no. xvii.2; there is also a small fragment in a Scottish private collection (Edinburgh 1994, no. 56).

---

Fig. 68 Giulio Romano, *The Triumphal Feast of Scipio*; pen and ink with wash and white heightening, 42.8 × 57.5 cm (Musée Condé, Chantilly)
MICHELANGELO ANSELMI
Lucca or Siena 1491–2 – Parma c.1554–6

41. St Anselm appearing to the Abbot Helsin c.1532

Red chalk (two shades), stumped and washed over in places
21.3 × 16.0 cm
Extensively inscribed on the verso
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Anselmi trained in Siena with Sodoma and 
and had moved to Parma by c.1520. He was highly 
regarded in his adopted city, working exten-
ively in the three main churches of the 
Steccata, San Giovanni Evangelista and the 
Duomo, and was a worthy competitor to 
Correggio and Parmigianino, whose fame 
was more widespread and longer lasting.1

The drawing is a study for a fresco by 
Anselmi in the Oratorio della Concezione in 
Parma, which he decorated between 1532 and 
1535 with the assistance of Francesco Maria 
Rondani.2 It corresponds with one of the four 
pendentives below the dome of the oratory 
(fig. 69), and shows St Anselm, Archbishop of 
Canterbury (d. 1109), appearing in a vision to 
Helsin, Abbot of Ramsey, during a storm at sea. 
There are significant differences between the 
drawing and the painting, in which St Anselm 
appears standing on the waves before the boat, 
and the indeterminate background seen here 
have become a remarkably ambitious panoramic 
seascape. The scene is conceived as a fictive 
shaped panel, supported by figures seated in 
the upper corners of the pendentive.

The celebration (indeed the very principle) 
of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin 
was both controversial and of confused origins. 
There is some evidence that in England the 
festival was celebrated during Saxon times and 
suppressed on the Norman invasion. The first 
reinstitution of the festival was at Ramsey in 
Kent around 1070, as promised by Abbot 
Helsin (the Latinised form of his Saxon name 
Æthelsige) when his ship, on a voyage from 
Denmark, was saved from a storm by the 
appearance of an angel. This vision was 
described in several sources, including the 
Roman breviary of 1473. (The festival of the 
Immaculate Conception was not formally 
adopted by the Roman Church until 1476.)

A separate tradition, promulgated by the 
Council of Canterbury in 1325, attributed the 
re-establishment of the festival to St Anselm. 
This seems to have been a confusion with 
St Anselm’s nephew, also called Anselm, who as 
Abbot of Bury St Edmunds was an enthusiastic 
proponent of the feast early in the twelfth 
century. There was also a spurious letter in 
circulation, purportedly written by St Anselm, 
that described Helsin’s vision.

On the verso is a long inscription, cut and 
difficult to read, that describes a miracle of 
the Virgin in one of the other pendentives 
of the oratory.

1 For Anselmi see Popham 1953; Popham 1957, 
pp. 102–13, 169–72; Ghidiglia Qintavalle 1960; 
2 See Ghidiglia Qintavalle 1958; Ghidiglia Qintavalle 
1960, pp. 79–81. For the documents see Ricci 1906.
On 10 May 1531 Parmigianino (see nos. 36–7) received the commission to decorate the church of Santa Maria della Steccata, Parma. In eighteen months he was to fresco the vault of the eastern apse (the semi-dome of which was to depict the Coronation of the Virgin), the soffits of the northern and southern transepts, and the friezes and cornices. A revised contract of 27 September 1535 stated that the whole scheme was to be completed within two years, but when the confraternity finally lost patience with Parmigianino in December 1539 it appears that work in the semi-dome had not even begun. The commission was passed to Giulio Romano (no. 40), to whose designs Michelangelo Anselmi (no. 41) executed the fresco seen today.

When Parmigianino received the commission he had already submitted a drawing of the Coronation, possibly that now in the Galleria Nazionale, Parma,1 in which Christ and the Madonna are seated symmetrically at the centre, surrounded by an abundance of musical angels. Subsequent drawings for the fresco – later in style than the Parma sheet, and possibly from the middle of the decade – attempt to reduce the congestion seen in that drawing and clarify the composition. Here the Madonna, touching her hand to her breast in humility, is borne up by angels towards Christ, who is seated centrally on a rainbow-like arc and holding out the crown towards her. The sketch pays little attention to the precise shape of the semicircular field. In the Courtauld Institute is a more cogitated study in which the Madonna is turned outwards towards the viewer, and her right hand gestures down towards a bearded figure standing as if on the ledge of the apse.2 He is probably the Baptist, to whom was dedicated the oratory that preceded the Steccata on the site, and who was also one of Parma’s patron saints. The Virgin’s action would then be one of intercession with Christ on behalf of the city. In a subsequent drawing in Turin – usually considered autograph but possibly a seventeenth-century copy – this male figure has been reduced in size and sits with legs crossed; he is balanced on the opposite side of the apse by what appears to be a large standing angel,3 This is our last glimpse of Parmigianino’s thoughts on the doomed project.

On the verso of the sheet (fig. 70) are a wonderful group of sketches that show Parmigianino’s restless imagination at its best. In the centre are the figures of Apollo and the bound Marsyas, from a well-known ancient gem design; at upper left, two sketches of the infant Baptist with the lamb; at lower left, two elegant studies of the Madonna and Child; below, three figures wielding axes; and in the right margin, female heads and a section of egg-and-dart moulding.

---

1. Popham 1971, no. 559; Parma 2003, no. 2.3.94.
3. Popham 1971, no. 594; ibid., no. 0C.48, at Windsor, is a seventeenth-century copy of the centre of the design at the same stage of development (A1 0554).
FRANCESCO PRIMATICCIO
Bologna 1504/5–Paris 1570

43. Joseph sold by his brothers to the Ishmaelite merchants(?) c.1541–6

Pen and ink and pale red wash with white heightening, over black and red chalk underdrawing; traces of light squaring in black chalk, the outlines indented with a stylus
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Though Primaticcio trained in Bologna with Innocenzo da Imola and Bagnacavallo, his formative influence was Giulio Romano in Mantua (nos. 38–40), whom he served as an assistant between 1526 and 1532. He was then invited to Fontainebleau by Francis I, and with the exception of occasional spells back in Italy he spent the rest of his career at the French court, where he gradually became the dominant artist. Many of Primaticcio’s works were reproduced in prints, and his compositions were thus well known across Europe.

The present drawing, and another in the Louvre depicting the Forge of Vulcan (fig. 71),¹ can be connected with a pair of paintings for the chimney breast of the Cabinet du Roi at Fontainebleau, executed as part of a campaign of decoration by Primaticcio between 1541 and 1546.¹ The paintings, unusually on panel rather than in fresco, were recorded in inventories of 1642 and 1709–10, but were removed in 1713 and are now lost.³ The companion to the Forge of Vulcan was in the earlier inventory described as ‘Joseph, as his brothers came to visit him in Egypt’. Zerner suggested that the specific episode depicted was the search of the baggage of Joseph’s brothers after he had sent them back to their father with sacks of corn, in one of which was planted a silver cup.⁴ A more explicit depiction of searching or discovery might however have been expected – only the figure at far right opens any of the baggage, and the ornate vase standing at lower left (modelled on an antique vase known to Primaticcio through an engraving by Agostino Veneziano⁵), to which no one pays any attention, is unlikely to have been the hidden cup. Mariette came closer in suggesting that the engraving depicted the journey to Egypt of the Ishmaelite merchants to whom Joseph was sold.⁶

Some sort of transaction is taking place: the youth to the right of centre holds a chain as if evaluating its weight, and the bearded man at centre left feels around inside his cloak for a purse. This may in fact be the sale of Joseph by his brothers to the merchants, and the coffer at far right, being opened by one of the youths, seems to give forth a trousered leg, presumably that of the bound Joseph. The two paintings are an odd pair, one from mythology, the other from the Old Testament, and while the forge of Vulcan was a common subject for chimney paintings, the relationship between the two subjects remains obscure. Béguin suggested that Primaticcio’s pair might be ‘an enigmatic pairing on the theme of deceit and the power of the word over action’, but it is doubtful if any viewer of the paintings would have been able to elicit such a connection.⁷

The drawing is executed with more meticulous wash and less red chalk than the Forge of Vulcan, and its attribution has been the subject of some debate. Popham judged that its style matched that of a drawing at Windsor with an early ascription to Luca Penni (possibly a signature), and thus attributed this drawing to Penni too. Recently Cordellier strongly supported the old attribution to Primaticcio, though Béguin thought that it ‘does not compare favourably’ with the Louvre drawing.⁸ The crispness of the details and the quality of modelling do favour an attribution to Primaticcio himself, though the function of the drawing is not entirely certain, and a vigorous study in red chalk alone for the figure group, in the Uffizi, does not help to resolve the issue.⁹

The figures correspond exactly with those in two prints of the school of Fontainebleau: one in reverse signed with the initials of Leon Davent and lettered Bol inventeur a Fontainebleau (Primaticcio was known as ‘Bolognese’ from his place of birth); the other anonymous, in the
same sense as the drawing, and probably copied from the first print, adding a different background.10 Like fig. 71, and indeed like many other compositional drawings by Primaticcio, the outlines of the figures were indented with a stylus to transfer the composition directly to the copper plate or to an intermediate drawing for the use of the etcher or engraver. But there are also very light traces of squaring in black chalk here, most visible in the cloak of the dominant man at centre right, probably indicating that the composition was to be scaled up to the size of the painting. The drawing may thus have served several purposes: a modello for the approval of the patron (hence its painstaking level of finish), a working study for the painting, and thereafter a model for the printmaker to follow.

1 Louvre, inv. 8533; Paris 2004, no. 121.
2 This connection was first noted by Herbet 1896, pp. 25–6.
3 A small painting of cupids in Wiesbaden (Paris 2004, no. 122) may be a fragment of the Vulcan; see also Béguin 2005, p. 242, who illustrated a painting of the whole scene in a private collection as an alternative candidate for the original work.
4 Zerner 1969, no. 1959, supported by Cordellier in Paris 2004. See also Boorsch in Los Angeles etc. 1994–5, pp. 87, 260.
5 Bartsch xiv, p. 387, no. 541, as observed by Byrne 1977, p. 153.
6 Mariette 1851–60, iv, p. 218; his editors (footnote to p. 218) suggested instead that the scene was the Magi loading their gifts before the journey to pay homage to Christ.
7 Cordellier in Paris 2004, p. 268; Béguin 2005, p. 242. Cordellier noted that in 1630 Diego Velázquez had painted two related subjects in Rome, Jacob Receiving Joseph’s Coat and Apollo Telling Vulcan of his Wife’s Adultery, which share the theme of deceit.
9 Paris 2004, no. 123.
10 Bartsch xvi, respectively p. 331, no. 63 and p. 412, no. 92, the latter attributed to the ‘Master of Cadmus’ by Jenkins in Paris 2004, p. 43.
Nicolò dell’Abate
Modena c.1509–?Fontainebleau 1571

44. A scene from Orlando innamorato c.1545
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Nicolò dell’Abate was probably trained by his father, a stuccoist, and by Antonio Begarelli, the dominant sculptor of Renaissance Modena. After a spell apparently serving as a soldier, he pursued a career as a painter, mainly executing decorative schemes on pastoral, courtly or literary themes. By 1552 he had moved to the French court at Fontainebleau to work alongside Primaticcio (no. 43), and he remained in France for the rest of his life.

The drawing is one of four known by Abate in a similar format, on courtly or chivalric themes; the others are in the Uffizi, the Louvre and the Getty. In addition, a fifth scene is known through an old copy in Munich. All were initially circular in format – a compass point here lies above the lady’s shoulder, and the drawing has been made up to a near square by reusing an excised portion of the upper part of the drawing at lower right. The original form of the composition can be seen in an old copy in an album of drawings in Modena.

Van Waardenonijen convincingly identified the Windsor and Uffizi drawings as illustrations to Book 2 of Matteo Maria Boiardo’s verse-romance Orlando innamorato, left unfinished at Boiardo’s death in 1494 and published the following year. The Uffizi drawing illustrates Canto xv, which recounts the story of Ranald searching for Angelica in the Ardennes, and the Windsor drawing the passage from Canto xxv, octave 23, to Canto xxv, octave 17. In that episode Brandimarte and Fiordelisa reach a palace, where a maiden stands at a balcony signalling that they should pass by and not enter. Instead Brandimarte approaches, and inside finds a giant struggling with a serpent. Brandimarte battles at length with the giant, who uses the serpent as his weapon – the giant brandishing the serpent is visible in the left background of the drawing, and Brandimarte with his sword drawn was trimmed off when the drawing was squared up (he can be seen in the Modena copy).

After Brandimarte triumphs over the giant, he finds that the door through which he had entered has vanished. Eventually the maiden whom they saw earlier appears. She asks Brandimarte to take courage, to open a tomb that lies in the courtyard, and to kiss whatever emerges. Brandimarte thinks nothing of this task, but when he forces open the tomb a dragon emerges, its mouth gaping. The knight steps back in amazement and puts his hand to his sword, but the maiden implores him to kiss the serpent or he will die. Gradually Brandimarte edges closer, and when he finally kisses the dragon it turns (of course) into the fairy who built the palace.

Abate seems to have executed three decorative schemes on the subject of Orlando during the 1540s. Only one survives in part, formerly in the Palazzo Torfanini in Bologna and now in the Pinacoteca, in which the scenes take place in tall arched landscapes. Two earlier cycles are mentioned in documents: a series of ‘favole del Furioso’ for Giulio Boiardo, descendant of Matteo Maria, in the castle at Scandiano (perhaps confusing Ariosto’s Orlando furioso with Boiardo’s Orlando innamorato); and the decoration of the Palazzo Ducale at Sassuolo, about which the documentation is unclear, referring variously to a room known as ‘dell’Orlando’ and ‘delle Pazzie d’Orlando’, and to a room adorned with five ovato (literally ‘oval’) framed paintings by Abate of unspecified subjects.

The coincidence of the number of paintings in this last scheme with the number of known compositions from the series under discussion is beguiling, but the multiplicity of probable literary sources argues against the drawings being connected with a single cycle. Further, the Louvre drawing is distinct in style and technique from the other three autograph sheets. Van Waardenonijen noted that the pricking of the outlines of most of the drawings indicated that they were to be reproduced on the same scale (and thus too small for fresco decoration) and, given their circular format, suggested that the drawings were models for painted maiolica plates. On the same grounds, and given their monochrome chiaroscuro effects, Lorenzini proposed that they may rather have been models for the decoration of parade armour.

In the absence of any comparable surviving works after designs by Abate it is impossible to be certain, but the pricking and diversity of style do seem to indicate that this ‘series’ of drawings in fact comprises a number of distinct projects, testifying to the vogue for these romantic tales in sixteenth-century Emilia.

1 Respectively Uffizi, inv. 593-4; Louvre, inv. 20746 (Béguin 1969, nos. 30–31; Modena 2005, no. 90–91); Getty, inv. 87.66.41 (Goldner and Hendrix 1992, no. 25).
3 Biblioteca Estense Universitaria, MS G. U. 5.9, fol. 30 (repr. Modena 2005, no. 1732).
5 A full English translation of the poem can be found in Boiardo 1989 edn. Van Waardenonijen also identified the episode depicted in the Munich copy in Orlando furioso, Canto xxxvi, octaves 46–51, Béguin 1995, p. 157, cautiously suggested that the Getty drawing might depict Canto xxxvi, octave 76, in the same poem. The episode illustrated in the Paris drawing has not been identified in any source.
7 For the documentary references see Béguin 1969, pp. 88–90; Garofalo in Modena 2005, pp. 114–16.
GIULIO CAMPI
Cremona c.1508–1573

45. The Raising of Lazarus c.1547
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Giulio Campi was the most accomplished of a family of painters active in and around Cremona throughout the sixteenth century. He worked on several occasions for the humanist scholar Marco Girolamo Vida, also a native of Cremona, and from 1532 Bishop of Alba, south of Turin. For Vida he painted a St Lawrence, still in the Duomo of Alba; designed the woodcut frontispiece for Vida’s Cremoniensis orationes of 1550; and, most significantly, reconstructed and decorated the small church of Santa Margherita in Cremona, of which Vida was titular prior. The completion of the new church (if not of the interior decoration) in 1547 is recorded in an inscription on the façade. With his brother Antonio, Giulio frescoed the entire interior, including six scenes in the side-chapels – in fact little more than arched recesses in the walls of the barrel-vaulted church. On the right are the Presentation in the Temple, the Dispute in the Temple and the Preaching of Jesus, and on the left, the Entry into Jerusalem, the Raising of Lazarus (for which this large drawing is a final study) and the Transfiguration and Healing of the Possessed Child (for which there is an equally large study at Windsor). The smaller frescoes in the vault illustrate Old Testament scenes that prefigure the life of Christ below.3

The Raising of Lazarus (fig. 72) is set against a heavy architectural backdrop of a pediment supported by twinned Ionic columns and crowned with sculpture; the effect is strongly reminiscent of Campi’s own architectural works, such as the monumental frame to his altarpiece of St Michael in the Duomo of Cremona. Campi’s classicising tendencies during the 1540s are evident in the rich, broad colouring of the paintings and the symmetry of the compositions. The former can be attributed to the example of Pordenone (no. 82), who had executed frescoes in the Duomo in the early 1520s, but the latter owes more to Raphael and his followers in Rome. Campi would have been aware of many of Raphael’s compositions through prints, and he may have visited Rome a few years before beginning work in Santa Margherita. The iconography and composition of the Transfiguration, for example, is dependent on Raphael’s painting of the same subject then in San Pietro in Montorio, and Godi noted in the Raising of Lazarus the derivation of the figures of Christ and Lazarus (both reversed), and the Ionic portico in the background, from motifs in Baldassare Peruzzi’s fresco of the Presentation in the Temple in Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.4

Bora attributed to Giulio a sketch in Prague for the three figures standing to the left in the Lazarus.5 A set of full-size copies on canvas of the six lateral frescoes was on the Italian art market in 1971.6

Fig. 72 Giulio Campi, The Raising of Lazarus; fresco (Santa Margherita, Cremona)

156
Pellegrino Tibaldi
Puria di Valsolda, Lombardy 1527 – Milan 1596

46. The Annunciation of the Conception of the Baptist c. 1552–5

Pen and ink with wash and white heightening over red chalk, on buff paper
42.3 × 28.4 cm, arched
BL 5965

PROVENANCE
Royal Collection by c. 1810 (Inv. A, p. 54, Pellegrino Tibaldi, Primaticcio, Procaccini &c; 3 to 7 … And the large emblematical composition, (a slight Sketch). These are painted by Pellegrino Tibaldi, in the Palazzo Poggi…)

REFERENCES
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 947; DeGrazia 1984, no. 104; Llewellyn and Romalli 1992, no. 60; Joannides 1996, no. 65

Though he was born in Lombardy, Tibaldi’s early training was in Bologna, and he travelled to Rome around 1547. Once there, like Taddeo Zuccaro (no. 22), he rapidly assimilated the prevailing style that combined the solidity of Michelangelo with the compositional and colouristic sophistication of Raphael’s followers – notably Perino del Vaga (nos. 4, 16), whose work in the Castel Sant’Angelo Tibaldi continued after Perino’s death in 1547. Tibaldi was employed by the Bolognese Giovanni Poggi to decorate his villa outside the Porta del Popolo, among many other decorative schemes in Rome. Poggi was created a cardinal in 1551, and in gratitude he gave his villa and vineyard to Pope Julius III, who built the Villa Giulia (see no. 47) on this land and later demolished Poggi’s old villa. In 1552 Poggi presented the church of San Giacomo Maggiore in Bologna with a number of reliquaries; Tibaldi probably travelled to Bologna around that time to plan the construction and decoration of a chapel for Poggi in San Giacomo Maggiore and to work on Poggi’s palazzo in the city.

Tibaldi was again in Rome in late 1553, and a document of July 1554 suggests that the Poggi Chapel was by then substantially complete. 1 It is not known whether this refers only to the construction or to the extensive decorative work as well; Tibaldi was in Loreto for much of 1554 and the first half of 1555, and given the short timescale it seems more likely that he did not begin the chapel frescoes until later in 1555. The Cardinal died and was buried in the chapel in February 1556, though Tibaldi may have continued to work on the Poggi projects until 1558 when he moved to Ancona, leaving his altarpiece of the Baptism for the chapel to be completed in 1561 by Prospero Fontana (no. 47). 2

This is a study for the fresco of the Annunciation of the Conception of St John the Baptist (Poggi’s name saint) on the right wall of the chapel (fig. 73). As explained by DeGrazia, 3 Tibaldi’s treatment of the subject differs from the account in the Gospel of St Luke (1: 5–25). The biblical text relates that the priest Zacharias was burning incense in the temple when the angel Gabriel appeared beside him, telling him that his elderly wife Elizabeth would bear him a son, to be called John, and that Zacharias would be struck dumb until this came to pass. Here however the angel lowers down from the heavens to announce the news to Elizabeth herself, who rests one knee on a fallen temple column indicating the passing of the old order. In the left background is an enthroned priest, presumably Zacharias, under an aedicule.

In the painting the aedicule has disappeared – only a shadowy and apparently incidental priest remains, gesturing in astonishment at the apparition. The figures to the right have been reduced to a saturnine old man, presumably Zacharias, leaning on a staff, with a mother at his feet suckling her child. DeGrazia suggested that the mother might be St Elizabeth again, looking up as she waits for Zacharias to break his dumbness by revealing the name of the child. Such a conflation of episodes and repetition of a figure in a single scene would be unusual in the sixteenth century (though common in the fifteenth). The mother, while facially similar to the annunciate Elizabeth, appears much younger; mothers with children were standard staffage figures in such scenes (and indeed three other children can be seen in the fresco, one at far left and two in the background), and her child displays none of the attributes of the infant Baptist. The Birth of the Baptist is one of the small oval scenes frescoed by Tibaldi in the vault of the chapel.

Briganti noted the Roman roots of Tibaldi’s paintings in the Poggi Chapel, in particular Raphael’s Transfiguration, Salvati’s Visitation, and Michelangelo’s Conversion of St Paul in the Cappella Paolina of the Vatican. 4 In his drawings of individual figures Tibaldi was indebted to Michelangelo, but the style of the present sheet owes nothing to that artist; the wandering lines betray instead Tibaldi’s exposure in Rome to the drawings of Perino del Vaga and Taddeo Zuccaro, and the painterly use of red chalk and white heightening are more akin to his Emilian forerunner, Correggio.

1 Winckelmann 1986, p. 486.
3 DeGrazia 1984, under no. 104.
4 Briganti 1945, pp. 81–2; Tibaldi’s response to Michelangelo was enlarged upon by Joannides 1996. See for example a large and highly finished red chalk drawing, in a private collection, for the figure of St Elizabeth and the figure immediately behind her to the right, published by Roli 1987.
**Prospero Fontana**
Bologna c.1510–1597

47. **Virtue subduing Fortune 1553**

Pen and ink with wash over black chalk
36.0 × 24.0 cm, the corners cut

---

**Provenance**
Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 54; Pellegrino Tibaldi, Primaticcio, Procaccini et al., among ’38 to 49. Various Lombard Masters, contemporaries with the above’)

**References**
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 1066; Blunt 1971, no. 176

Prospero Fontana was born in Bologna, trained there reportedly with Innocenzo da Imola, and worked for much of his career in the city; but he also collaborated with Girolamo da Treviso and Perino del Vaga in Genoa and with Giorgio Vasari in Rome, Florence and Rimini, which led to his eclectic style that veered between Classicism and Mannerism. Between 1550 and 1555 Fontana benefited from the patronage of Pope Julius III, decorating the Belvedere in the Vatican, painting the Pope’s portrait, and working in the Palazzo di Firenze in Rome for the Pope’s brother. After a spell in Bologna in 1551–2, during which he may have collaborated with Pellegrino Tibaldi on the Poggi projects (see no. 46), Fontana also supervised the decoration of the Pope’s private residence, the Villa Giulia.1 The villa was built in a vineyard given by Giovanni Poggi to the Pope when Poggi was created a cardinal in January 1551, and was still incomplete when Julius died in March 1555.

The drawing is a study for a stucco oval relief, at the centre of the vault of one of the two ground-floor chambers of the Villa Giulia (fig. 74). In his life of Taddeo Zuccaro, Vasari (who knew Fontana well, working with him on several occasions) stated that:

In 1551 Stefano Veltroni of Monte Sansovino [Vasari’s cousin and assistant] was commanded by the Pope and by Vasari to decorate with grotesques the rooms of the villa which had belonged to Cardinal Poggi, outside the Porta del Popolo on a hill. He called in Taddeo to help, and caused him to paint, as the central feature of the decoration, one of the Pope’s devices, that of Occasion seizing Fortune by the hair and making as if to cut it off with her shears.2 (Vasari’s identification of the figures in the impresa is a little garbled. Occasion and Fortune were often conflated during the Renaissance;3 the figure to the left here is Virtue, who subdues Fortune, meaning that the conduct of a virtuous life can overcome the whims of chance.) Popham thus attributed the drawing to Taddeo, but Gere pointed out that Vasari’s account – which refers to a painting, not a stucco – describes Poggi’s old villa and not the Villa Giulia.4 Julius apparently used the old villa as a residence while the new one was being built, and presumably commissioned his impresa to be painted in the old villa to signify the change of ownership. On completion of the Villa Giulia, Poggi’s villa was torn down.

Vasari went on to state that Prospero Fontana painted ‘many things’ in the new villa with the assistance of Taddeo (who had returned to Rome in early 1553, after two years in Urbino and Pesaro).5 Dividing responsibility for the paintings in the two rooms on either side of the vestibule is very problematic: Gere assigned those in the left room to Fontana and those in the right to Taddeo, whereas Nova attributed all the ground-floor rooms to Fontana with the exception of the vault of the atrium.6 Fontana, then in his early forties, was more experienced than Taddeo, in his early twenties; he seems from the documentation to have been in control of the project, and it must have been he who provided the designs from which the stuccoists worked. Payments to the stuccoists in the villa do not go beyond the summer of 1553, and on the basis of these documents Hoffmann attributed the stuccoes to Federico Brandani (but erroneously assigned the drawing to Vasari).7 The stuccoes would probably have been the first part of the decoration to be executed, and it may be deduced that Fontana had provided designs for the stuccoists shortly after his engagement on the project in early 1553.

A large sketch for the composition is in the Uffizi.8 The present sheet was based directly on that sketch as a final refinement of the composition, adding the sail and shell-boat of Fortune, correcting the position of Virtue’s right foot, and adjusting the relative heights of the figures so that Virtue stands slightly taller than Fortune and more comfortably grasps her hair.

---

1 For the Villa Giulia see Nova 1988, pp. 58–71.
2 Vasari 1906 edn, vii, p. 81.
3 Kiefer (F.) 1979.
4 Gere 1965, p. 201.
5 Vasari 1906 edn, vii, p. 82.
8 Uffizi, inv. 109066-; Di Giampaolo 1989, no. 89.
GIOVANNI BATTISTA CASTELLO
Crema, Lombardy c.1525 – Madrid 1569

48.  **Jupiter c.1560**

Pen and ink with wash and white heightening, over black chalk, squared in black chalk, on blue paper
39.6 × 27.6 cm
Verso: Studies of legs and an arm. Black chalk and pen and ink on blue paper
Inscribed verso by William Gibson: *Julio Romano / 6.3. / 1.4

PROVENANCE
William Gibson; probably acquired by Charles II;

REFERENCE
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 829

Giovanni Battista Castello was formerly thought to have been born near Bergamo in the early years of the century, but recently published documents seem to establish that he was in fact born in Crema in the mid-1520s; his father’s origins in Bergamo explain his epithet ‘il Bergamasco’.1 Castello settled in Genoa around 1540 and was patronised by the alum magnate Tobia Pallavicino, who reportedly sent him to study in Rome. After his return to Genoa, Castello executed extensive fresco cycles in both Pallavicino’s suburban residence, Villa Pallavicino delle Peschiere, and his city palace (now known as Palazzo Carrega Cataldi). By 1567 Castello had moved to the Spanish court, where he died.

The drawing is a study for Castello’s fresco of the *Council of the Gods* (fig. 75), in the vault of the Salone of Pallavicino’s villa.2 The building was probably begun in the mid to late 1550s, supposedly to the designs of Galeazzo Alessi though possibly with Castello’s involvement, as he is documented as having been the architect of the concurrent construction of Pallavicino’s palazzo.3 A large part of the *piano nobile* was frescoed by Castello and Luca Cambiaso as the construction of each room was completed.4 The decorative programme owed much to frescoes that Castello presumably saw in Rome, especially those in Agostino Chigi’s villa, now known as the Villa Farnesina (see no. 13). The walls of the Salone are decorated with illusionistic architecture in emulation of Baldassare Peruzzi’s frescoes on the first floor of the Farnesina; above the cornice are four *quadri riportati* with scenes from the *Odyssey*, while in the crown of the vault is a homage to Raphael’s fresco of the *Council of the Gods* in the Farnesina loggia. Castello’s frescoes were badly damaged during the Second World War and heavily restored.

Raphael’s and Castello’s frescoes depict different subjects – Raphael’s shows Jupiter permitting Psyche to enter the ranks of the gods and marry Cupid, while Castello’s shows the deliberations of Jupiter and the other gods over whether Odysseus should be allowed to end his wanderings and return home. Castello had already used a version of Raphael’s figure in his lunette fresco of the same subject in the Villa Lanzi at Gorlago (later transferred to the Palazzo della Prefettura, Bergamo).5 Castello’s figure of Jupiter follows Raphael’s in his general attitude and in the pose of the legs, though he changed the positions of head, arms and eagle, and the Neptune behind Jupiter bears little relationship to Raphael’s equivalent figure. Popham noted that the drapery of Castello’s figure is derived from Agostino Veneziano’s engraving of *St Mark*.6 On the verso of the sheet are separate nude studies of Jupiter’s legs, and two studies of an arm that does not seem to correspond with any that appear in the fresco.

1 Marubbi 1986, pp. 50, 63, docs. 33–5, 75–6.
2 As first identified by Rosso del Brenna 1969, p. 117.
3 See a summary of the evidence in Parma (E.) 2000, p. 312.
6 Bartsch xiv, p. 83, no. 94.
**JACOPO BERTOIA (ZANGUIDI)**
Parma 1544 – ?Rome 1573

49. **Six horses’ heads c. 1570**

Pen and ink with wash over red chalk, some outlines indented
26.2 × 42.6 cm

Verso: Venus floating in a shell, with Mercury and another god. Pen and ink; the whole of the verso rubbed with black chalk

**PROVENANCE**
William Gibson; probably acquired by Charles II;
Royal Collection by c. 1770(?) probably Inv. A, p. 17
(an inserted sheet that pre-dates the rest of the inventory), among ‘3 Studys for Neptunes sea horses
by Perino del Vago’; also probably p. 53, among
‘Four fine studies of Neptunes, Sea Horses, with
Monsters, &c… Perin del Vago’

**REFERENCES**
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 981; Blunt 1971, no. 44;
Cambridge 1985, no. 8; DeGrazia 1991, pp. 137–8,
no. d 94

Bertoia was born in Parma four years after the
death of Parmigianino, who was the dominant
influence on Bertoia’s dynamic draughtsmanship,
and their drawings have often been
confused in the past. Many of Bertoia’s works,
mostly in fresco, were executed for the Farnese
family in Parma, Rome and Caprarola. In Parma
he seems to have worked under Girolamo Mirola
(d. 1570), and in the absence of documentation it
can be difficult to separate the two artists’ work.

The old attribution to Perino del Vaga
(no. 16) was characteristic of a tendency, still
encountered today, to give to that artist any
decorative mid-sixteenth-century drawing with
bold, flowing lines. Pouncey first identified
the draughtsman as Bertoia,1 and Ghidiglia
Quintavalle suggested a possible connection
with the eccentric decorations of the Palazzo
Borri, Parma, apparently painted by associates
of Bertoia or Mirola, which include scenes of
horses fighting with (and biting) huntsmen and
wild animals.2 This apparently odd subject had
a distinguished pedigree, for struggling horses
had been a favourite motif of Leonardo da
Vinci (see no. 11).3 Popham noted the close
relationship in type and action, without any
exact correspondence, to the heads of fighting
horses in the background of a painting of the
*Rape and Intervention of the Sabine Women* in
the Palazzo Comunale, Bologna (fig. 76).4 That
painting may be identical with ‘Un quadro
grande con sopra l’istoria delle Sabine di
mano di Mirola’ in the 1587 inventory of
Ranuccio Farnese, though the inventory might
equally well have been listing a large, damaged
canvas of the *Intervention of the Sabine Women*
now in Naples.\(^1\) It is impossible to attribute
the Bologna painting to Mirola or Bertoia
with any certainty; DeGrazia classed it as
‘Bertoia/Mirola’, and thought that both the
present drawing and another formerly on the
art market, corresponding with the principal
figure group of the Bologna painting, were
derivations by Bertoia from the painting.\(^6\)
Certainly it is hard to see a drawing such as
this as a practical study for a painting, and
its purpose remains uncertain.

A drawing in the British Museum corre-
sponds exactly with the pairs of heads at left
and right, the central pair being replaced by a
charioteer.\(^7\) The four heads were traced from
this sheet; their outlines are indented with a
stylus and the verso of the sheet blackened to
effect a ‘carbon copy’. That blackening obscures
a sketch of a framed mythological scene (fig. 77)
with Mercury on the right, Venus in her shell
on the left, and another figure in the centre,
clearly a study for a decorative fresco of the
type that Bertoia produced throughout his
short career. DeGrazia proposed that it was
related to the Sala Mitologica of the Palazzo
Borri, though the scenes in that frieze are oval
in shape and in fictive frames that bear no
strong resemblance to that studied here.\(^8\)

1 As reported in Blunt 1971, no. 44. Antal 1951,
p. 32, had connected the drawing with Pellegrino
Tibaldi’s grisailles in the Sala della Giustizia of
the Castel Sant’Angelo.
2 Ghidiglia Quintavalle 1963, p. 56.
3 For the subject see Viatte 1996.
4 Popham 1967, p. 112.
7 Popham 1967, no. 231.
**LELIO ORSI**
Novellara, Emilia 1508/11–1587

50. **A crossbowman c.1575**

Pen and ink, brush and yellow-brown ink, white heightening, over black chalk
25.2 × 19.8 cm
Inscribed on the verso: LXIII, with a paraph
RL 4791

**PROVENANCE**
Possibly Gonzaga family of Novellara; Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 85, *Scuola Veneziana*, among '12 to 14. Paolo Cagliari detto Paolo Veronese')

**REFERENCES**
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 529; Reggio Emilia 1950, no. D15

The son of the painter Bernardino Orsi, Lelio was born and died in the town of Novellara in the Po plain, and spent most of his career working there or in the nearby city of Reggio Emilia, combining Michelangelesque strength with a quirky Emilian-Lombard Mannerism. The majority of his projects were secular, primarily the fresco decoration of buildings, including illusionistic façades; such works were vulnerable to redecoration and the elements, and only fragments of Orsi’s frescoes survive. No altarpieces are known, and all his subject paintings are small in scale. His one documented work as an architect is Santo Stefano in Novellara, the church in which he is buried. But he was a prolific and highly accomplished draughtsman, as was recognised in his own day: his tomb slab is inscribed *Lelio Urso in architectura magno, in Pictura majori, et in Delineamentis optimo* ('Lelio Orsi, in architecture great, in painting better, and in drawing the best').

This drawing is a study for part of a fresco on the façade of a house. The crossbowman appears at the centre of four drawings of an elaborate façade, in Modena, Chatsworth (fig. 78), Princeton, and the Louvre – the number of surviving copies testifies to the celebrity of the design. The Modena drawing is probably the original, but is poorly preserved and difficult to read; the Chatsworth copy is reproduced here for the sake of clarity. The façade features Orsi’s coat of arms with two bears (a pun on his surname), which also appears on his tomb slab. Orsi no doubt wished the painting to act as an advertisement for his skills, and he filled the modest surface area with an illusionistic tableau of fire, cloud, draperies, struggling nudes, collapsing columns, and here the amusing figure of a crossbowman aiming his bolt into the street below. The composition bears obvious similarities to Giulio Romano’s celebrated fresco of the *Giants Buried under Pelion and Ossa* in the Sala dei Giganti of the Palazzo Te, Mantua, of 1532–4, combined with the lithe muscularity of mid-century artists such as Tibaldi and Primaticcio.

In connection with one of the drawings of the façade (probably that now at Princeton), Mariette described an engraving of a crossbowman, attributed to Cornelis Cort, dated 1570 and ‘after the painting in Reggio’. He seems to have been referring (with a slip over the date) to an anonymous engraving inscribed *Regij. 1579* (fig. 79), in which the figure is close enough to that here to conclude that it was copied from Orsi. The inscription locates the motif in Reggio, and despite Mariette’s apparent assumption (rather than knowledge) that the inscription referred to the existence of an easel painting, it is probable that the façade design was actually executed; and further, that it was not that of Orsi’s own house (in Novellara), but that of his brother Gianbattista, who lived in Reggio and with whom Lelio presumably lodged when he was working in that city. While the date of 1579 on the print...
probably refers to the execution of the engraving rather than the design of the façade, the boldness of the drawing does support a date in the 1570s.\(^5\) Orsi's movements during that decade are poorly documented, but he was in Reggio in 1576, when he received payments for work including the scheme to fresco the apse of San Prospero (subsequently painted by Camillo Procaccini — see no. 55).\(^6\)

The drawing is one of many by Orsi that bear on the verso a large roman numeral drawn with the brush, followed by an unidentified paraph (mark of ownership). This was interpreted by Kossoff as the mark of the Gonzaga of Novellara, in whose collection an inventory of 1728 listed 'cento pezzi di disegno in grande' by Orsi.\(^7\)


2 See Bentini 1990 for the iconography of the façade.


4 Bierens de Haan 1948, no. 244; King 2006.

5 Salvin and Chiotti (in Reggio Emilia 1950) dated the drawing to c. 1565 on the basis of an order of that year that all the houses in Novellara should be repainted, though that order surely referred simply to a painting of the plaster rather than to frescoing. On stylistic grounds, Romani 1984, pp. 76–7, suggested a date in the later 1560s; Frisoni (in Reggio Emilia 1987–8, pp. 209–11) and Di Giampaolo (1989) preferred the 1570s.

6 For a summary of Orsi's activity, and information on the residences of Lelio and Gianbattista, see M. Pirondini, 'La vita e l'ambiente', in Reggio Emilia 1987–8, pp. 21–38, and King 2006.

7 F. Kossoff in London 1970, under no. 31. For this type of inscription see another drawing at Windsor (Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 528), inscribed LVII, and many others elsewhere, including Reggio Emilia 1987–8, nos. 7, 109, 117–18, 125, 127–8, 136, 166, 168, 174, 187, 201.
BARTOLOMEO PASSEROTTI
Bologna 1529–1592

51. The Funeral of the Virgin 1577 (?)

Pen and ink with wash over hard black chalk, coarsely squared in black chalk
50.8 x 34.7 cm
Inscribed at lower right in red ink: B. passerotto; and on the verso (laid down), in the hand of William Gibson: Bartolomeo Passerotto 6.3.
RL 6037

PROVENANCE
William Gibson; thus probably acquired by Charles II; Royal Collection by c. 1810 (Inv. A, p. 55, Zucaro Passarotti e Altri Maestri, among '46 to '54. By ... Passarotti')

REFERENCES
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 658; Höper 1987, II, no. 2339

After a period in Rome as a young man, which had little lasting effect on his art, Bartolomeo Passerotti returned to his home city of Bologna by 1560 and soon established himself as the city’s leading painter until the emergence of the Carracci in the 1580s (though he seems never to have worked in fresco). His many portraits are subdued in mood, but his subject paintings are typified by showy, dramatic effects. The same is true of his pen drawings, often finished sheets rather than preparatory studies, aiming at the power of Michelangelo but coming closer to the formalism of Bandinelli (no. 21) without attaining the discipline of either.

At the centre of this drawing the body of the Virgin Mary lies on a bier. Sprawled in front is a Pharisee who, according to the Apocrypha, tried to tip the body of the Virgin from her bier as the Disciples carried her to her tomb; at this his hands were petrified and broke off at the wrist. In the crypt below, the Virgin’s body is laid to rest. The architecture resembles that in Passerotti’s altarpiece of the Madonna Enthroned with Saints in San Giacomo Maggiore, Bologna (commissioned in 1564), with a raised central platform before a vaulted recess, the lunette of which is pierced by an oculus. At the top of the sheet the Madonna’s tiny soul is carried to heaven by angels – an uncommon iconography, for it is normally her material body that is seen ascending to leave an empty tomb.

This sheet is unusual among Passerotti’s drawings in being apparently a modello for an altarpiece rather than a piece of independent bravura penmanship. The sheet is squared for transfer, and the artist suppressed his usual exuberantly superficial draughtsmanship to attain a more controlled handling similar to the modello in the Uffizi for his Madonna in Glory with Saints in San Petronio, Bologna, of the late 1560s.

Though the subject is related to the artist’s Assumption of around 1570 in Sant’Angela Merici (formerly Sant’Afra), Brescia, there is no significant compositional similarity to that painting. Ghirardi suggested instead a possible connection with a project for the high altarpiece of the Duomo in Cremona. Bernardino Gatti’s painting of the Assumption for that site was incomplete at his death in 1576, and the officers of the Duomo sought another artist to complete the work. Orazio Samacchini was first offered the contract, but he too died the following year, and in the absence of any other artist in Cremona considered suitable, the unfinished panel was sent to Bologna. In July 1577 the Archbishop of Bologna, Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti, proposed Prospero Fontana for the commission, and a month later Passerotti sent two drawings to the officers of the Duomo for consideration – one a copy of Gatti’s composition, the other his own invention – and offered to take on the project. Noting that the Windsor drawing may be dated around this span of years and has approximately the same proportions as Gatti’s altarpiece, Ghirardi plausibly suggested that this might have been Passerotti’s alternative design. But Passerotti failed to interest the fabbricieri in his proposal, for the following month they were seeking information about Federico Barocci. In the end Gatti’s altarpiece was never completed, and was installed, unfinished, in the Duomo of Cremona, where it remains.

1 Höper (1987, II, p. 192) noted that this figure was quoted from Raphael’s design for Joseph Commanding the Sun and Moon to Stand Still in the Vatican Loggie; Ghirardi (1993) thought instead that he was quoted from the terracotta group of the Death of the Virgin by Alfonso Lombardo in Santa Maria della Vita, Bologna.
2 On the composition see Ghirardi 1993, pp. 114–15.
3 Uffizi, inv. 771-e; Di Giampaolo 1989, no. 105.
4 Ghirardi 1995, pp. 287–90; see also Bora in Cremona 1985, p. 11.
The Calling of St Andrew c. 1580

Pen and ink with wash, white heightening and some scratching out, over black chalk and stylus, with traces of squaring in black chalk, on toned and discoloured paper

47.0 x 34.7 cm
RL 6830

PROVENANCE
Royal Collection by c. 1810 (Inv. A, p. 125, Two Volumes of Large Drawings called Opere Varie; [5] Christ calling St Andrew (the Picture is in the Church of St Andrew at Pesaro by ... F. Barrocio)

REFERENCES
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 107; Emiliani 1975, no. 138; Cambridge 2006, no. 52

Federico Barocci was perhaps the most innovative painter of altarpieces working in Italy in the later sixteenth century. He married the strong local colour and elaborate compositions of high Mannerism with intense observation from the life, to produce a body of work unequalled among his contemporaries in its richness and variety. His influence would have been still greater had more of his paintings survived, mostly in vigorous pen and wash or carefully blended chalks.

The drawing is a modello for Barocci’s large altarpiece of the Calling of St Andrew (fig. 80), dated 1583, painted for the oratory of the fishermen’s guild, the Confraternita di Sant’ Andrea, in Pesaro. St Peter, who is usually the more prominent of the two men called by Christ, is seen clambering out of the boat beyond. The work was looted in 1797 by Napoleon’s troops and since 1802 has been in Brussels. According to Bellori, Barocci painted this work at the instance of the Duchess of Urbino [Lucrezia d’Este], who wrote to him about it in 1580, and the payment was 200 gold scudi. Upon its completion, after 1584, the Duke [Francesco Maria II] liked it so much that he requested it from the brothers of the confraternity and sent it as a gift to Philip II, King of Spain, as St Andrew was the protector of the Knights of the Order of the Golden Fleece [of which the Duke was made a member in 1585].

Today this remarkable painting is conserved in the Escorial … Barocci then painted a second version of the St Andrew for the same confraternity in Pesaro.1

In fact it was the replica, commissioned by Francesco Maria II, that was sent to Spain (where it remains in the Escorial), and a long correspondence between the Duke and his ambassador in Madrid gives a fascinating insight into the way in which such diplomatic gifts were regarded.2 The Duke wrote in 1586: ‘two years ago we ordered a large painting from Federico Barocci to send to the King together with two fine packhorses that we had in the stable, but Barocci has taken so long over his work that the horses are dead’. Finally on 12 November 1588 the ambassador wrote that the painting had arrived to general approval, though some had commented jealously that ‘Christ should have been a little taller, and that St Andrew would have been better proportioned with a thinner leg’.

The Escorial version is a little larger than the first piece, but there are few differences of detail between the two paintings. More striking are the differences between this modello and the paintings. Other than the form of St Andrew’s cloak, the most significant difference is the landscape: here the stony shoreline curves round behind Christ to a prominent tree-lined headland, and the distant mountains loom over a city. The vaporous landscape is possibly the most notable feature of the painting; it is perhaps a feature that Barocci was not able to try out in the drawing, and appears instead to have been essayed by him in an oil bozzetto in a private collection.3

The drawing was prepared with substantial underdrawing in the figures of St Peter (very free), St Andrew (more careful, defining the body under the drapery) and the boatman (a vertical establishing the line of his pole). Despite the poor surface condition of the drawing, which seems to have been displayed unglazed for long periods of time, some traces of squaring can be seen, particularly around the foot of St Peter. There are many other drawings for the whole figures and details of the composition, mainly in Berlin and the Uffizi.

1 Bellori 1672, p. 181.
3 Published by Borea 1976, pp. 55, 61.
In addition to the sheer number of drawings by Barocci that are known, his graphic oeuvre is notable for two types of study that find few parallels in the works of his contemporaries. These are his modelli (such as no. 52), the large, highly pictorial compositional drawings in pen, wash and white on toned paper, which survive for most of his larger paintings; and his head studies in coloured chalks, both natural and fabricated, which he exploited more extensively than any artist before the eighteenth century. This medium allowed him to determine both lighting and colour in the preparatory sheet, and thus he could use his precious painting time as efficiently as possible.

Olsen first proposed that this head might be a study for the prominently silhouetted figure in the centre-left background of Barocci’s Madonna del Popolo (fig. 81), and that suggestion has been generally accepted. The Madonna del Popolo was painted for the chapel of the Confraternita dei Laici di Santa Maria Misericordia in the church of Santa Maria della Pieve, Arezzo. Negotiations for the painting began in 1574, though it was not until the following summer that Barocci could be persuaded to visit Arezzo to inspect the proposed site for the painting. In a letter to his patrons of February 1576 he stated that he had finished all of his drawings and had almost finished his cartoon, thus dating the preparatory work to the autumn and winter of 1575–6. In 1578, worried about the progress of the painting, one of the confraternity visited Barocci in his studio in Urbino; a dispute over payment took up much of that year, and the painting was finally dispatched in 1579. It was transferred to the Uffizi in 1786.

There are in fact several bearded old men looking up in the hazy background of the painting, none of whom corresponds exactly with the head studied here. This rather wizened old man recurs frequently in Barocci’s paintings and drawings, and Emiliani reproduced several such drawn heads as possible studies for the painting. The staffage of the painting is very different in the lower register from that of Barocci’s modello (at Chatsworth), and Barocci must have continued to consider the role and form of the bystanders even after he had completed the modello.
MALOSSO (GIOVANNI BATTISTA TROTTI)
Cremona 1555/6 – Parma 1619

54. **The Assumption c. 1585**

Pen and ink with wash over black chalk, with corrections in lead white, squared in black chalk
48.8 × 34.7 cm
RL 5046

PROVENANCE
Royal Collection by c. 1810 (among four volumes of *Diversi Maestri Antichi* summarily listed in Inv. A, p. 16)

REFERENCE
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 968

As a young man Malosso married the niece of his master, Bernardino Campi (pupil of Giulio Campi; see no. 45). After inheriting Bernardino’s workshop on his death in 1591, Malosso became the leading painter in Cremona. In 1604 he entered the service of Duke Ranuccio Farnese in Parma, and spent most of the rest of his life at the Farnese court. Although Malosso’s paintings can be stolid in execution, he had travelled widely in Italy in the 1580s and he introduced a range of Bolognese and Roman ideas into Cremonese painting. The strong, angular lines of a drawing such as this, and not least its ambitious draughtsmanship, display a knowledge of Federico Barocci’s powerful *modelli* for his own paintings (such as no. 52).¹

Malosso’s large studio executed many works for Cremona and throughout Emilia and eastern Lombardy. Most of these, especially those for more provincial locations, were executed by Malosso’s assistants following his drawings, and inevitably this led to much recycling of compositions.² This drawing illustrates the phenomenon well. It is known in three other versions: an exact copy of high quality – perhaps even an autograph repetition – in Poughkeepsie;³ a stiffer copy on the art market;⁴ and a smaller version in the Uffizi.⁵ The composition also corresponds with two paintings, neither of which was executed by Malosso himself. One is a small oval ceiling fresco in the church of San Vincenzo in Cremona, weak in execution and most probably by an assistant of Malosso.⁶

More significant is a painting attributed to Giuseppe Pesenti (1560 – after 1610), possibly with the assistance of his brothers Giovan Paolo and Galeazzo, in the church of Santa Maria di Bressanoro near the town of Castelleone, north of Cremona.⁷ The Pesenti brothers were occasional assistants of Malosso, and members of a family of craftsmen who held a virtual monopoly on gilding in Cremona throughout the sixteenth century. The decoration of the chapel dedicated to the Virgin in the church was financed from the will of Giovan Antonio Marchesi di Castel­leone, who died in 1586. He left his fortune to the monastery of Bressanoro, and Giuseppe Pesenti was commissioned in January 1587 to paint the altarpiece and to fresco the chapel with scenes from the life of the Virgin. The altarpiece has disappeared, but was recorded in 1630 with the date 1588 and the signature of Giovan Paolo Pesenti (though it was Giuseppe who had signed the contract).⁸ In the cupola are frescoed eight scenes from the early life of the Virgin, and on the side-walls are scenes of her later life, including *Christ Disputing with the Doctors* and the *Assumption*, both based on drawings by Malosso.⁹

Pesenti’s frescoes in Castelleone establish that Malosso had devised this composition by 1588 at the latest, but it is unlikely that he would work up a *modello* as grand as this for the benefit of a sometime assistant working independently in a provincial church. It is much more probable that this was the *modello* for an altarpiece of the mid-1580s by Malosso himself, and that the derivative drawings and paintings are echoes of this putative lost work. Malosso himself reused the figure of the Virgin, with a change to the angle of the head, in his painting of *‘Cremona Guerriera’ Presented to the Madonna* now in the Museo Civico, Cremona.

---

¹ On Malosso’s early awareness of Barocci see Di Giampaolo 1976.
³ Vassar College Art Gallery, Poughkeepsie, NY, inv. 1992.27.2.
⁴ Sotheby’s, London, 9 July 2003, lot 39, where attributed to Malosso’s pupil Ermenegildo Lodi.
⁵ Uffizi, inv. 11316-8, cited by Di Giampaolo 1974, p. 30, n. 39, noting the derivation of the composition from Bernardino Gatti’s painting of the subject in the Cavalcabò collection in Cremona.
⁶ Di Giampaolo 1974, p. 19, fig. 19.
⁷ For this project see Nolla 1987.
⁸ Fiammeno 1630, p. 175.
⁹ Malosso’s *modello* of *Christ Disputing with the Doctors* is in the Uffizi, inv. 2030-9.
Camillo Procaccini was born in Bologna, and had enrolled as a student in the painters’ guild (of which his father Ercole was head) by 1571. Little is known of his youthful work before a visit to Rome around 1580, but the scale of the commission for which this work is a study – the Last Judgement frescoed in the apse of San Prospero in Reggio Emilia (fig. 82) – implies that by the mid-1580s he had already attained a significant reputation.

The project is unusually well documented. In 1576 Lelio Orsi (no. 50) was paid for a design for the scheme, but his quotation of 1,000 scudi to carry out the work, in collaboration with Bernardino Campi, was deemed too high. The canons began to look around for other artists: in March 1583 they approached Federico Zuccaro (nos. 10, 26) in Rome to see if he would be willing to paint the apse, following Orsi’s design. The answer was clearly no, for a year later Procaccini arrived in Reggio ‘to see the choir to be painted’. But the canons still wished to consult the elderly Orsi, who was living in Novellara, and then sent agents to Sabbioneta to evaluate the work of Bernardino Campi, perhaps nervous to entrust such a commission to a young artist. It was not until 9 January 1585 that a contract was finally signed with Procaccini, to execute the work within two years to his own designs, those of Orsi evidently having been discarded. Work on the frescoes began that April, after the artist had been sent to Parma to study paintings there, no doubt primarily those by Correggio and Parmigianino.

In September 1586 Procaccini asked for six weeks’ leave to visit Milan, where his father and brothers were now based. Probably believing that he intended to abandon the project, the canons refused him permission, threatening him with imprisonment, and Procaccini pressed on until November 1587, when he was allowed to suspend work having frescoed the apse and its vault (and leaving unfinished a second project in San Prospero, in the chapel of the Confraternity of St Roch). The canons’ fears were well founded, for Procaccini failed to return to Reggio, and they turned to Bernardino Campi and then (after Campi’s death in 1591) to Giovanni Battista Tinti to continue the work. Finally in April 1597 Procaccini returned to Reggio to fresco the remainder of the vault, and by October 1598 the project was complete.

This drawing corresponds with a group to the lower left of the Last Judgement. The figure style of the fresco, of this drawing, and of another in Jerusalem for a further group in the fresco, strongly evokes the precedent of Pellegrino Tibaldi’s Bolognese paintings of a generation earlier, in particular his frescoes in the Palazzo Poggi (cf. no. 46). The drawings are unusually large and elaborate for figure studies of this period, and there remains a question about the status and function of these sheets, which have some of the features typical of copies – not only the exact correspondence with the painting, but also the heads and clouds in the background, the sort of pictorial setting that is rarely met with in a preparatory drawing. The style, however, is exactly that of Procaccini, and there can be little doubt about his authorship of these drawings. Perhaps the nervousness of the patrons about Procaccini’s ability to see through a project of this scale led him to produce unusually explicit preparatory drawings, to put their minds at ease; alternatively, these may have been finished drawings executed by Procaccini for what seems to have been a growing collectors’ market for drawings in Emilia. Apparently Procaccini kept some version of the drawing with him, for these two figures formed the basis for the youths perched in a tree in his Triumph of David, one of the huge organ shutters painted in 1592–5 for the Duomo of Milan.

Fig. 82. Camillo Procaccini, The Last Judgement (detail); fresco (San Prospero, Reggio Emilia)
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56. **Portrait of a Young Man c. 1505**
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**REFERENCE**  
Shearman 1983, no. 37

The Bellini family is the most important in the history of Venetian painting. Giovanni and his brother Gentile were trained in the workshop of their father, Jacopo, by the 1480s Giovanni was a master of every aspect of painting, and yet he was able to develop throughout his long career, absorbing new influences. Even in his eighties he was still learning, this time from the younger artists Giorgione and Titian. His reputation as a portraitist was considerable: Vasari writes that 'it became customary in that city [Venice] that every man of any note should have his portrait painted by Giovanni or by some other'; Isabella d'Este wrote to Cecilia Gallerani asking to borrow her portrait by Leonardo to compare with 'certain fine portraits by the hand of Giovanni Bellini' that she was looking at.1

The current work follows a characteristic Bellini format, with a head and shoulders seen in a three-quarter view behind a parapet. It is also his last surviving portrait and the only one to include a landscape background. Bellini's portraits are inspired by Netherlandish examples and by the work of the most Netherlandish of his Italian contemporaries, Antonello da Messina. These influences affected the format and persuaded Bellini increasingly to abandon an egg tempera technique in favour of the medium of oil paint, seen here. Portraits by Hans Memling, which are mentioned in Venetian inventories of the period, often contain landscape backgrounds.2 In the portraits from this later period of his life, such as that of Doge Leonardo Loredan of c. 1501 (National Gallery, London), Bellini signed his name on a cartellino or fictive label, the one apparently attached to the parapet here. The cursive lowercase lettering of the signature here is rare, but other late paintings also have it.3

The panel was probably always this size since it has a barbe (paint ridge) on all its edges, with about 7 mm of unpainted panel beyond, which suggests that it originally had an integral frame (in other words, the artist framed and then painted, rather than vice versa). X-radiography reveals some adjustments to the castle tower on the left and to the hat, hair and collar of the sitter, who may originally have been looking more upward.4

The subject wears the black biretta and robe of the Venetian cittadino, the rank below the Venetian patrician class. In the 1440s Philip Hendy and Ludwig Goldscheider proposed that the portrait depicted the writer and humanist Pietro Bembo (1470–1547). Bembo was born in Venice but lived at the courts of Urbino, Ferrara and Rome, where he became Papal Secretary in 1513 and Cardinal in 1538. His best-known work was Gli Asolani of 1505, a dialogue on love set at the court of Caterina Cornaro at Asolo. An eminent philologist, he wrote on the Latin and Italian languages and amassed a large collection of paintings and antiquities. According to Vasari, Giovanni Bellini painted a portrait of Bembo's mistress (now lost) and received two sonnets praising its beauty in return.5 Bellini's later biographer Carlo Ridolfi lists a portrait of Pietro Bembo by Bellini, but there is no mention of it elsewhere.6

The date of the Royal Collection picture (c. 1505) means that Pietro Bembo would here be aged about 35, which is plausible. Unfortunately identification must depend upon a handful of portraits recording Bembo's features in his sixties: a medal of c. 1532 by Valerio Belli (the only one to show him beardless); one of the later 1550s by the medallist ‘TP’; the famous Titian portrait of c. 1539 (National Gallery of Art, Washington dc); and another medal of c. 1547, attributed to Danese Cattaneo.7 Comparison of likenesses is notoriously subjective: the Bellini portrait does have Bembo's aquiline nose, but the distinctive high set of the eyes and sloping angle of the brow seem different.

After 1500 Bellini gradually developed a broader, simplified style, losing the need to specify details. Here sitter and landscape are painted as a unity, both lit by a soft golden light, outlines blurred. Infra-red reflectography reveals very little underdrawing, which is typical of Bellini's late technique. The modelling of the man's face is extremely subtle and in places insubstantial so that the shadow where his lips press together is created by one under-drawn line, with no carbon or brown in the layers of paint. The horizon line across the top of the bridge was marked into the ground, over which there are few layers of paint. There is a lack of detail in the middle ground, while the distant buildings and mountains are built up in simple planes. The marble parapet here is a trompe l'œil, apparently as real as the frame, onto which a sharply creased cartellino seems to have been casually attached; behind this barrier Bembo (or some yet unidentified Venetian citizen) inhabits a separate, softer, more luminous and tranquil world.8

---

1 Vasari 1966–87 edn, iii, p. 168; Luzio 1887, p. 32.  
2 See Portrait of a Man with a Letter, c. 1480 (Uffizi).  
3 Morelli rejected the work on these grounds, leading to a nineteenth-century attribution to Francesco Bissolo. The portrait was rebabtised by analogy with other late Bellini paintings with a similar lettering on their cartellini. The Virgin and Child, c. 1510–12 (Galleria Borghese, Rome); Woman with a Mirror, 1535 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna); and The Feast of the Gods, 1514 (National Gallery of Art, Washington dc).  
4 See Dunkerton 2004, p. 218, for Bellini's technique.  
5 Hendy and Goldscheider (1945, pp. 22, 34, and Gregorovius 1948 edn, p. 350) based their argument on a resemblance between this portrait and a Valerio Belli medal (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris) and a passage in Ridolfi's life of Bellini (Ridolfi 1914–24 edn, i, p. 73).  
6 For Messer Pietro Bembo, then, before he went to live with Pope Leo X, Giovanni made a portrait of the lady that he loved, so lifelike that, even as Simone Sanese [Simone Martini] had been celebrated in the past by the Florentine Petrarca, so was Giovanni deservedly celebrated in his verses by this Venetian, as in the following sonnet (Vasari 1966–87 edn, iii, p. 430; Vasari 1912–15 edn, i, p. 183).  
7 Ridolfi 1914–24 edn, i, p. 73; von Hadeln suggested that Ridolfi had misinterpreted Vasari's earlier account.  
8 Atwood 2003, nos. 2172, 3242, 3254, 9344; Wethey 1969–75, ii, p. 82, no. 19; see Gregorovius 1948, p. 350.  
Provenance
Presumably bought by Jan Reynst in Venice in 1646; acquired from the Gerard Reynst collection, Amsterdam, by the States of Holland and West Friesland and presented to Charles II, 1660

Reference
Shearman 1983, no. 38

Both the subject and authorship of this haunting painting have been widely debated. Although not giving a concert in the modern sense of a public performance, the four participants are probably singing from a score held by the central woman. Indications of stylised musical notation can be seen on the open and rolled sheets of music; the ages and sexes of the figures suggest the four parts of traditional harmony; the woman seems to be beating time by tapping her index finger, as was contemporary practice. Their dress is modest rather than fashionable: the woman wears a simple cap and shawl (camicia) around her shoulders of a type worn in Venice by respectable middle-class women, though usually older than this one.

In subject and style this painting is closely related to The Three Ages of Man (fig. 83) attributed to Giorgione (Palazzo Pitti, Florence), which depicts a similar ensemble of three singers. The three ages are also the subject of Titian’s famous painting (Duke of Sutherland collection, National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh) in which an amorous music-making couple inhabit a landscape with children and an old man. The present work may also symbolise the three ages, the couple representing ‘the prime of life’, accompanied by childhood and old age. The idea of ‘measuring time’, both here and in Giorgione’s Three Ages of Man, has a philosophical as well as a musical dimension.

Music, like poetry, was associated with love in the Renaissance, represented here by the affectionate couple on the left. Music also symbolises harmony, a divine gift that supplied the universal laws governing the natural world and perhaps governs this solemn gathering. Some later sixteenth-century musical groups, such as Leandro Bassano’s Musical Family of 1580–85 (Uffizi), allude to the unity of the family, which is also a possible interpretation here.

Singers in Venetian art – in this painting, in Giorgione’s Three Ages of Man, and in many later examples – are often shown with their mouths closed. The thoughtful expressions of the subjects here give the impression that the music has already sounded and is mirrored on their faces as a poignant reminiscence. This emphasis on inwardness and mood, rather than a clear narrative, gives the painting a powerful, enigmatic quality, which links it with Giorgione’s work and the taste of his circle of sophisticated Venetian patricians.

An assessment of the painting has been made difficult by the many small losses of paint across the canvas. The painstaking restoration, completed in 2001, revealed bright colour contrasts of green, orange and red; strong light from the left with softly modelled faces; and a wealth of fine detail, especially in the pearls on the woman’s dress and the edges of her shawl. The style is direct and the paint layers thinly applied. Very little underdrawing can be found and x-radiography reveals only a few minor changes, which are visible through the final paint layers.

Who painted this picture? It is clearly Giorgionesque and can be related in style (as in subject matter) to The Three Ages of Man. It has been attributed to Giorgione at intervals, most recently (albeit tentatively) in the Queen’s Gallery Royal Treasures exhibition in 2002. Since the nineteenth century, when the attribution to Giorgione was doubted, many alternative candidates have been proposed: Giovanni Bellini, Lorenzo Lotto, Previtali, Morto da Feltre, Domenico Mancini, Francesco Torbido and Giulio Campagnola. Recent discussion of the painting has narrowed the field to three possibilities: Giorgione, Giovanni Bellini, or an artist working in Bellini’s workshop. The techniques of both Giovanni Bellini and Giorgione are now better understood, following analysis undertaken for recent exhibitions, which would seem to tip the balance in favour of Bellini or his circle. Bellini carefully planned his compositions, with little underdrawing and thin paint layers. By the first decade of the sixteenth century his contours were softened, his forms constructed in broad, flat planes of colour, and his lighting more diffused (see no. 58). The folds of drapery in The Concert, softer and less substantial than

Fig. 83. Attributed to Giorgione, The Three Ages of Man; oil on panel, 62 × 77 cm (Galleria Palatina, Palazzo Pitti, Florence)
in paintings by Giorgione, can be compared to Bellini’s style at this date, as, for instance, in his Drunkeness of Noah of c.1514 (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Besançon) and his Lamentation of c.1510 (Accademia, Venice); in the latter the head of Joseph of Arimathea is very similar to the older man in the Royal Collection painting.

The artist here is probably not Giovanni Bellini himself, but his pupil, Vittore di Matteo, who assumed the name ‘Belliniano’ in honour of his master and who (like all Venetian artists at this date) fell under the influence of Giorgione.14 There are a few signed works, and on this basis other paintings have been attributed to Belliniano.15 The soft, mysterious lighting can be found in his signed Portrait of a Man Praying in Front of the Crucifixion of 1518 (Accademia Carrara, Bergamo). Very similar heads appear in the large Martyrdom of St Mark of 1515–26 (Accademia, Venice), begun by Bellini and completed and signed by Belliniano, although Lorenzo Lotto and possibly Giovanni Mansueti also contributed figures.16 The warm light in the Martyrdom creates the same suggestive shadows on buildings and faces as appear in this painting. Belliniano’s Virgin and Child with St John the Baptist and Job (or St Onophrius) (Museo Correr, Venice; fig. 84) has similar facial types, flat folds of drapery and soft play of light creating interesting shadows.

2 This tapping beat was called a tactus and can be seen in Lorenzo Zacchia’s Musical Group with Four Figures of 1523 (Collection of Dr Herrmann Moeck, Celle) and Sebastiano Florigero’s Musical Conversation of c.1525 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich); see Slim 2002, pp. 155–70, pls. 1, 3. The author is indebted to Colin Slim for the above suggestions and for his help in understanding the musical subject here.
3 Giorgione’s La Vecchia (Accademia, Venice) is at the other extreme of age. Older women usually wear the cap and shawl in contemporary paintings by Titian, Benedetto Diana and Carpaccio; see Newton 1988, figs 31, 33.
4 In both paintings the singers are probably performing a frottola, a secular Renaissance song that flourished in the north Italian courts; it was out of this form that the three- to six-part polyphony of the madrigal developed by 1530. For the attribution of the Pitti painting see Lucco 1989, pp. 11–29 and Anderson 1997, p. 298.
8 Colin Slim feels that the man on the left and the boy may be singing.
10 The painting was conserved by Karen Ashworth.
14 The author is grateful to Jill Dunkerton for suggesting the attribution and Sonia Guetta Finzi, Museo Correr, for her assistance.
ATTRIBUTED TO TITIAN (TIZIANO VECELLO)
Pie de Cadore, Veneto c.1485–90 – Venice 1576

58. Boy with a Pipe (‘The Shepherd’) c.1510–15
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Apparent identical to a painting attributed to Giorgione in the collection of Charles I; valued at £30 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to de Crite and associates, February 1650; recovered at the Restoration
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Titian is the greatest painter of the Venetian school. He was apprenticed to Gentile Bellini and then Giovanni Bellini, before working with Giorgione, whose death in 1510 left him without a rival.

In the present work a boy appears to be lost in thought, glancing down to the right as if he has just stopped playing the pipe in his hand. The idea of this haunting image has been generally ascribed to Giorgione. The question of its execution, however, has proved more complex: some scholars have stood by the traditional attribution to Giorgione, while others have suggested that it must have been created by one of his many followers working from (and perhaps freely adapting) a lost original. It is likely that Titian painted this work based on an original conceived by Giorgione.

Giorgione was probably inspired by the work of Leonardo da Vinci in his creation of this type – the poetic single figure – that became so popular with his patrons and with artists such as Titian, Sebastiano del Piombo and Cariani. Several examples of such works are mentioned by early historians. Two were recorded in 1531 by Marcantonio Michiel in the collection of a Venetian nobleman, Giovanni Ram: one was the Boy with an Arrow, now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (fig. 85) and a rare example of a painting still universally attributed to Giorgione; the other was a ‘shepherd who holds fruit in his hand’, a lost painting which seems from this description to be closely related to no. 58. The boy in Vienna has a tilt of the head, an introspective gaze and flowing curls, all elements that recur in the Royal Collection painting. A pipe is a less enigmatic attribute than an arrow: the theme of a shepherd boy with a pipe was part of the vogue for pastoral poetry promoted by Pietro Bembo (see no. 56) and his circle and the subject of Jacopo Sannazaro’s Arcadia (see no. 59). A lost Giorgione, described by Michiel as ‘the birth of Paris’, and known today through a copy by David Teniers (private collection, London) and an engraving, shows two shepherds in loose shirts and with similar hair, who apparently resembled the shepherd boy in this painting. In his early work Titian comes so close to Giorgione that their works have never been satisfactorily distinguished: Titian’s Three Ages of Man (National Gallery of Scotland) and the Concert Champêtre (Louvre), usually now attributed to him, create the same idyllic pastoral world and treat themes of love and music.

The Royal Collection painting was so admired by Bernard Berenson that he chose it as the one Giorgione to illustrate in his Venetian Painters of 1894. In his review of the Venetian Exhibition at the New Gallery, London, of 1895 (published in 1901), he argued that this was the only work in the exhibition that he could accept as by Giorgione. More recently some scholars have continued to accept this attribution and have dated the painting to a few years before Giorgione’s premature death in 1510. Others have followed Shearman in ascribing it to Titian when his work was closest to Giorgione. A comparison with Giorgione’s Boy with an Arrow in Vienna reveals a fundamentally different approach: the boy in Vienna has a still intensity, isolated from us in contemplation, while the subject of the Royal Collection painting seems caught in a thoughtful pause before re-joining the viewer’s world. The figure in Vienna emerges out of the dark background, the modelling and transitions from dark to light so subtle and finely nuanced that there is no evidence of painterly brushwork. The immediacy of the Royal Collection figure derives from the confident bravura in the handling of paint, seen in the fine curls of hair, the velvety modelling of the skin tones (particularly the hand), the folds of the linen shirt and the few strokes to convey the tie that falls over his blue robe. It has the three-dimensional presence of Titian and (at least in the undamaged areas of shirt, mantle and face) the quality of Titian’s brushwork. The handling, subject and deep chiaroscuro link this picture to his Three Ages of Man (National Gallery of Scotland), Concert Champêtre (Louvre) and Young Woman at her Toilet (Louvre). In all

Fig. 85 Giorgione, Boy with an Arrow, oil on panel, 48.0 x 42.0 cm (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna)

Fig. 86 X-radiograph of no. 58
these works, Titian takes up the mood and inventions of Giorgione and reinterprets them in his own vigorous style.

The x-radiography (fig. 86) reveals the free underpainting, particularly in the background which is taken right up to the outline of the face. It also reveals that the boy originally wore a more formal style of white shirt with continuous gathers under a slate-blue doublet. This is remarkably similar to the shirt and doublet originally worn by the figure in David with the Head of Goliath (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) before he was transformed into a David, also revealed by x-radiography (figs. 87 and 88). Originaly this figure held a lute (visible to the left of fig. 88) but was repainted to resemble Giorgione's self-portrait as David (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Brunswick). Recent analysis has shown that the panel and first gesso ground correspond with Giorgione's technique, but both subsequent figures were painted after Giorgione's death. Scholars have noticed the similarity between these two paintings: it may be that the first idea for the Vienna David and the Royal Collection Boy with a Pipe originated in the same Venetian studio. The similarity lies in their composition and type rather than handling of paint.

Giorgione's imaginary portraits were much in demand and he produced variants: Giovanni Ram kept a version of the Boy with an Arrow, which he believed to be the original, when he sold a copy to Antonio Pasqualigo. No. 58 and fig. 88 may both be based on the same Giorgione source; it is probable that no. 58 preceeded and influenced the Viennese painting.

3 Berenson 1894, pp. ix, 100; Berenson 1901, pp. 140–45. Other scholars at this time doubted the attribution to Giorgione; see Shearman 1983, p. 255.
4 It is accepted as by Giorgione by Pignatti (1969) and dated c. 1510. Sgarbi (1981, pp. 31–4) dates the painting to c. 1508 after the Fondaco dei Tedeschi frescoes. Ballarin (in Paris 1993, p. 347, no. 32) also accepts it as a Giorgione and dates it c. 1508.
6 This contrast is typical of the way in which Venetian artists took up Giorgione's invention; see Holberton 1994, p. 40.
for the Reynst collection. This effect was achieved by at least three layers: a creamy ground, a pale grey underpaint, and a warmer grey modulated in the shadows. X-radiography reveals that Titian first painted a long parapet below the wrist of the sitter, which he then altered to the diagonal of the table.

The portrait has been dated variously from c.1511 to the early 1520s. The style of the subject’s square-necked saione and gown (both with large, bulbous upper sleeves), the wide-necked chemise, the length and style of his hair with centre parting and the fashion for an indication of a moustache must date the work before 1520 and probably closer to 1513. The sitter wears the sober colours that were typically worn by Venetian male citizens over the age of 25. This portrait seems to fit into Titian’s career between the Portrait of a Man with a Quilted Sleeve of c.1510 (National Gallery, London) and his Man with a Glove, generally accepted as c.1523 (Louvre). The half-length view and the fact that Titian experimented with a parapet places this work closer to the National Gallery painting. This earlier date is confirmed by the dress, which resembles that of the Portrait of a Man (Musée Fesch, Ajaccio) and Portrait of a Man (so-called Ariosto) (Indianapolis Museum of Art), both also placed before 1520. The Louvre portrait exhibits slightly later fashions: shorter hair and the higher collar of the chemise tied at the neck. A similar style is worn by the man behind St Anthony in Titian’s Miracle of the Speaking Babe (1510–11; Scollett di Sant’Antonio, Padua) and by the papal litter bearers in Raphael’s Miracle of the Mass at Bolsena (1511–12; Stanza d’Eliodoro, Vatican). Titian seems to have favoured a restricted colour range in these early portraits, with cool blue-grey or green-grey backgrounds. The dense, almost swarthy flesh of the man recalls the face of the man in the centre of The Concert of c.1510–12 (Palazzo Pitti, Florence) or that of St Dominic in The Virgin and Child and St Catherine with St Dominic and a Donor of c.1512–14 (Fondazione Magnani-Rocca, Marniano).
No. 38. As in that case, Titian could here have based the poet's features on an earlier portrait (of c.1490), while depicting him in clothes that would have been fashionable in c.1513. The question therefore remains of whether this face records Sannazaro's appearance in c.1490. His likeness is known to us through a variety of images, including three medals, from which many later printed versions derived. A painting executed by the Venetian Gian Paolo de Agostini (c.1490–1524), probably around 1516, was described in a letter from Summonte to Michiel in 1524; a version survives in the Kress Collection, New Orleans Museum of Art, dating from c.1520 (fig. 89). An engraving attributed to Enea Vico is thought to record a lost painting of Sannazaro by Sebastiano del Piombo, once in Pietro Bembo's collection. A copy of a lost original in Paolo Giovio's series of famous men in his villa on Lake Como (Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan) is inscribed with his name. On Sannazaro's tomb in Santa Maria del Parto, Naples, a marble portrait bust by Giovan Angelo Montosorli (c.1507–63) thought to have been derived from Sannazaro's death mask was executed in 1536/7–42. This dossier of images of Sannazaro (most of them recording the appearance of a much older man) seems to match the Royal Collection portrait in the thick eyebrows, the set of the eyes, the long, slightly beaky nose and the heavy jaw. But the Agostini painting and Montosorli sculpture depict thin lips, the lower jutting out in a distinctive way with a pronounced distance between mouth and chin, features which do not appear in the present work. Titian might also have been expected to inscribe a portrait of such a famous man as he did with his 1523 portrait of Baldassare Castiglione (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin). In the end, the idea that this portrait depicts the inventor of the Renaissance pastoral is an attractive one, but is hard to prove. Titian's unsurpassed skill at characterisation conveys an imposing, erudite and intelligent man; whether it is Sannazaro or another humanist has yet to be decided.

2 There are four thin strips of canvas stitched to the edges, apparently by the artist, as the original paint extends over the seam at the bottom edge. The ground structure of the additions is different from the central piece of canvas, and the pentiment of the parapet does not extend onto them, so they must have been added after work had begun. There is a pentiment in the angle of the book and another small change in the line of the cuff.
3 Shearman dates it c.1518–22 and summarises the dating by previous scholars. Joannides (2001) dates it c.1516.
4 Newton 1988, p. 9. The author is grateful to Jane Bridgeman for her help on dress. She suggests a date between 1510–13.
5 Others in the group are Portrait of a Man (known as Gian Giacomo Bartolotti da Parma, c.1515–18; Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), Portrait of a Man (c.1510–15; Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), Portrait of a Man (c.1520–23; Louvre), Portrait of a Young Man (c.1515–20; Earl of Halifax collection, National Gallery, London), Portrait of a Man (c.1519–22; Alte Pinakothek, Munich); Wethey 1969–75, ii, nos. 70, x–110, 44, 115, 45.
6 Shearman (1983, pp. 251–5) summarises the literature and argument.
7 Shearman 1983, fig. 17.
9 Sansovino 1578, fol. 4v; Shearman 1983, p. 253; and Kidwell 1993, p. 243, note 9. Raphael may have included his likeness on the far right side of Parnassus (c.1510; Camera della Segnatura, Vatican; fig. 31).
10 The three medals are listed in Hill 1930: no. 343 attributed to Adriano Fiorentino, c.1490; no. 350 by Girolamo Santacroce and possibly commissioned by Isabella d'Este in 1519; no. 354 attributed to Santacroce.
12 Kidwell 1993, p. 142, fig. 51; according to Michiel (2000 edn, p. 31) it was based on a lost earlier painting. D'Achiardi 1908, p. 339; Kidwell 1993, pp. 142, 177; Fletcher 1981a, pp. 461–2; Nicolini 1925, p. 161–4.
13 Kidwell 1993, pp. 177–8, 245.
ATTRIBUTED TO TITIAN (TIZIANO VECELLIO)
Pieve di Cadore, Veneto c.1485–90 – Venice 1576

60. *The Lovers* c.1510

Oil on canvas
74.9 × 65.6 cm
RCIN 403928

PROVENANCE
Acquired by Charles I; probably valued at £100 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to Hunt and Bass on 1 March 1653; recovered at the Restoration

REFERENCES
Shearman 1983, no. 65; Joannides 2001, pp. 253–4

The attribution and subject of this painting have been much debated. This arrangement of figures in art often depicts a courtesan or faithless wife in the arms of a young lover, with her duped, elderly and rich husband (or protector) in the background. The woman here does not wear the elaborate clothes or jewellery of a courtesan and there is no sense of treachery in the scene. She has either fainted and is held by a man feeling her heart (in the nineteenth-century the painting was called ‘a sick Lady, her Husband and a physician’) or she is resting against her lover in ecstasy. A print by Zoan Andrea (fl. c.1475–1520) called *The Lovers*, of c.1510–19, shows a couple in a similar arrangement and has been linked to this painting.

This is probably a scene from classical or Renaissance literature, but there is no obvious way of telling which, as Titian generally avoided giving figures period dress. Another version of the same composition in the Casa Buonarroti, Florence, was known as the *Death of Lucretia*, but there is no sword or wound to support this identification. Carlo Ridolfi, writing in 1648, mentions a Titian half-length of Cornelia fainting in the arms of Pompey, which von Hadeln and, more recently, Joannides have connected with this composition. The story comes from Lucan’s *Pharsalia* (Book V) of the first century AD: before his final battle with Caesar, Pompey orders his wife Cornelia to be taken to the safety of the island of Lesbos; at their parting, she faints into the arms of her attendants, who bear her away. However, this subject is rarely represented in art and the man who holds the woman in this painting seems to be too important to be an attendant. The more usual subject in art is Pompey’s previous wife, Julia, fainting from the shock of seeing his blood-stained gown, which again does not match this painting. Another possible source comes from Italian Renaissance literature and was first proposed by Crowe and Cavalcaselle: the collection of novellas by Matteo Bandello (1485–1561) contains two stories which could fit this scene. One is probably also the source for Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* and tells how a young woman secretly marries a boy, who is sent abroad by his father, leaving her obliged to marry another. She falls into a swoon, apparently dead, and is buried in the family vault; she is revived by her true husband on his return, who feels for the beat of her heart. If this subject is intended here, the age of the third figure would suggest that he is the second husband rather than the father. In another story the niece of the Duke of Burgundy secretly marries and eventually dies in the arms of a young man, Carlo Valdreo, who subsequently kills himself. Another possibility is that the subject derives from a similar type of story (or perhaps a different telling of the same story) which cannot be identified today.

This painting was described by Redgrave in 1858 as having ‘the appearance of being a genuine Titian’ but ‘much injured’. The original canvas was attached to a panel support (before or during the time of Charles I) and was only detached again when relined onto canvas in the nineteenth century. The section of wood branded with the collector’s mark of Charles I was saved at this time and attached to the new stretcher. The upper part of the painting is particularly damaged with many tears and losses visible on the x-radiograph; it was restored in 1906 and relined and restored in 1953–4. Of the three heads, the woman’s is in the best condition, though restored; the other
two have had to be substantially reconstructed. The man to the right is very thinly painted.

X-radiography also reveals that the woman was originally more decorous, with more of her breasts covered by drapery, and the man’s hand may have been in a different position. The man’s hat was altered and the third man’s hand on the woman’s shoulder was painted almost as an after-thought. The most surprising revelation is the long, sweeping lines working out the woman’s drapery in style and direction completely different from those finally painted. She may have worn a white chemise gathered at her shoulder comparable to that worn by Titian’s Lucretia (Gemäldegalerie, Vienna). The energy of the strokes and the radical difference between underpainting and final version are typical of Titian (fig. 90).

Various suggestions have been made as to the author of this painting over the years: Giorgione, Titian and artists influenced by him – Paris Bordone, Sebastiano del Piombo, and Cariani. Similar artists were suggested for the Casa Buonarroti version, originally owned by the Vendramin family in Venice. The composition was well known and much copied, for example by Van Dyck in his sketchbook, where his pen sketch is labelled Titian. The pentiments discovered by x-radiography analysis in the Royal Collection picture suggest that it should be regarded as the prime version and that the Buonarroti painting was made after it, by means of tracing.

The present author believes that The Lovers was painted by Titian, though this attribution must remain tentative in view of the damaged upper half of the painting. The least damaged areas, such as the man’s satin sleeve, have the dynamic brushwork and vibrant colour typical of Titian. In handling of paint and features it can be related to other half-lengths: A Portrait of a Man with a Quilted Sleeve (National Gallery, London) and the Salome or Judith with the Head of Holofernes (Doria Pamphilj Collection, Rome). The comparison, this time of costume and length of hair, with the National Gallery Man with a Quilted Sleeve also provides a date of c. 1510 for this painting. The composition and enigmatic subject matter fit the early preoccupations of Titian when he and his patrons were much influenced by the achievements of Giorgione.

2 Compare the costume in Giovanni Cariani’s Courteens and Gentlemen (private collection, Bergamo).
3 Bartsch 1509,002 in Zucker 1984, pp. 276–9. The meaning of the more decorous Venetian Lovers by Paris Bordone of c. 1523–5 (Brera), clearly inspired by no. 60, is also unclear, although the focus there is the gift to the woman of a gold chain.
6 Ridolfi 1914–24 edn, i, p. 170; von Hadeln postulates a lost painting, of which the Royal Collection and Casa Buonarroti versions are copies; Joannides (2001, pp. 253–4) believes the Royal Collection picture to be by Titian. Charles Hope (1993, pp. 171, 191) argues that Ridolfi is unreliable, giving to Titian subject matter he felt appropriate for an artist of his stature.
7 Lucan 1928 edn, pp. 295–301.
8 Valerius Maximus 2000 edn, i (Book iv,6), p. 497.
11 Sapegno in DDB, vi, pp. 687–713.
12 As Shearman pointed out, the exhibition catalogue entry in 1905, ‘Re-lined and transferred to canvas’, was modified by Cust to ‘transferred from panel to canvas’, giving rise to subsequent scholars, including Wethey (1969–75, iii, pp. 214–15, no. X.23), stating that the painting had been transferred from panel to canvas.
13 See illustration before restoration in Cust and Cook 1906, p. 70.
14 The multiple changes in the profile and chin-level of the woman’s head mentioned by Shearman are not visible on this x-ray.
15 Shearman (1983, no. 65) lists previous attributions; see Joannides (2001, pp. 253–4) for his attribution of the painting to Titian.
16 Adriani; 1965, fol.154v. For the Buonarroti painting see Shearman 1983, no. 65; Lucco (1980, p. 130) attributes it to Paris Bordone; Pedrocco (Venice 1990, p. 157) to Cariani.
17 The author is grateful to Elisabetta Archi for permission to examine the Casa Buonarroti painting, which has been traditionally regarded as the prime version. The left eye of the man on the right is higher in the Royal Collection painting because of inaccurate reconstruction and should match the Buonarrotti painting. The woman’s neck is narrower, her face less foreshortened in appearance; the beard of the man on the left thicker, his hat is simpler and his chemise and sleeve, which are in a richer purple red, are lower on his shoulder; the dark green folds of the woman’s dress are much less exciting.
18 Penny in London 2003a, pp. 82–3.
TITIAN (TIZIANO VECELLIO) AND WORKSHOP
Pieve di Cadore, Veneto c.1485–90 – Venice 1576

61. The Virgin and Child in a Landscape with Tobias and the Angel c.1535–40

Oil on panel
85.7 × 120.2 cm
RCIN 402863

PROVENANCE
Possibly Dalla Torre family, Venice; acquired by Jan Reynst in Venice, and from his brother Gerard's collection by the States of Holland and West Friesland for presentation to Charles II, 1660
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This painting was described by Ridolfi when he saw it in the Reynst collection as 'one of Titian's exceptional works' ("una delle singolari fatiche di Titiano"). The Dutch ambassadors reported that King Charles II found this painting the most pleasing of the Dutch gift (see Introduction pp. 31–2). Recent conservation has revealed areas of high quality, which go a long way to justifying this enthusiasm.

The painting is one of a group of four closely related compositions by Titian and his workshop representing the Virgin and Child in a landscape. They provide interesting evidence of the way in which Titian and his studio replicated compositions and developed a theme by introducing changes. The group shows Titian's own involvement in the production of variants. It is interesting that two out of three variants are on panel, based on a canvas original, especially as panel was a support more favoured by Titian in the early years of his career.4 The first (and probably prime) version is on canvas, the Virgin and Child with the Infant St John and a Female Saint or Donor of c.1532 (100.6 × 142.2 cm; National Gallery, London; fig. 91) which shows a female saint, possibly St Catherine, kneeling in adoration of the Christ Child. He raises his hand to his mother, perhaps to receive the fruit and the flower that the Virgin Mary reaches to take from St John the Baptist, seated to the left. In the background is an Annunciation to the Shepherds. Another version is the panel, dated either to the 1530s or 1550s (105.4 × 148.3 cm; Kimbell Museum, Fort Worth), showing the Virgin picking a flower, though x-radiography

---

394
has revealed that she originally took the flower from an angel who was painted out with dense foliage. A third version is the canvas in the Palazzo Pitti, Florence (93 × 130.2 cm) and shows the Virgin picking a flower more logically from a plant rather than a bush. The Christ Child holds the apple in his upraised hand and St John kneels with his lamb on the right. Recent x-radiography of this painting revealed that St John was originally placed to the left of the Virgin, as in the National Gallery version, and two hares touching noses were fully worked up in the right foreground, a motif copied from paintings by Giovanni Bellini and his workshop. In both these later variants the background contains a pastoral scene of shepherds with their flocks. The dress of the saint in the Pitti painting, now clearly identified as St Catherine with a wheel, recalls the National Gallery painting.

It is difficult to establish the order of these three versions of the composition or where the Royal Collection panel, which can be dated to c.1535–40, fits into the sequence. It is slightly smaller than the others, omitting St Catherine and St John and evolving into a simple Virgin and Child in a landscape, with a possible allusion to a Rest on the Flight into Egypt (though without Joseph). While Titian’s depiction of the Virgin and Child in a landscape looks back at Giovanni Bellini and Giorgione’s poetic visions of nature, it is also dramatically set within the artist’s own mountain landscape of the Dolomites. Unlike in the other versions, the Virgin and Child sit on a sandy bank in front of a little stream which gathers in a small waterfall lower right, reminding the viewer of ‘a spring of running water’ from the Song of Songs, associated with the Virgin. Flowers are emphasised here, with a spread of meticulously painted roses, towards which the Virgin turns. She, however, picks a single campanula, while Christ selects a red rose from the bunch of flowers gathered between their other hands. The flowers, like the stream and the rose garden, recall the enclosed garden (Hortus Conclusus), a symbol of Mary’s virginity that was popular in medieval and Renaissance imagery. The red rose
chosen by Christ alluded to the Virgin’s purity and sorrow, as well as to Christ’s own Passion.

Instead of the shepherds, the background now contains Tobias and the angel, very freely painted and contrasting markedly with the careful painting of the foreground. The journey of Tobias with his guardian, the Archangel Raphael, and his dog is told in the Book of Tobit from the Apocrypha. Tobias carries the fish, the entrails of which exorcise his future wife and heal his father’s blindness. The theme of Tobias was popular in mercantile towns and was associated with prayers for a safe and prosperous voyage. A very similar Tobias and the angel and dog appear in Tobias and the Angel Raphael with St John the Baptist by Titian and his studio, usually dated c. 1540–50 (San Marziale, Venice).

Analysis of the group of works reveals that a cartoon of the National Gallery painting must have been used for all three variants. The Virgin here matches that of the National Gallery version closely but differences elsewhere suggest that the tracing was adopted in a piecemeal fashion. The underdrawing, which can be studied by infra-red reflectography, shows careful, unimaginative traced lines for the Virgin’s head and torso. However, in the blue drapery the lines are not traced but loose and abrupt. The Virgin’s chest is delineated with two rough concentric lines and the Child’s position marked out in a similar fashion, showing Titian’s intervention in the design (fig. 92). Recent cleaning has revealed the rich ultramarine used for the Virgin’s mantle and the beauty of the detailed and precisely painted foliage and flowers. The freely painted, lively Christ Child on the crisp white cloth contrasts with the more prosaic head of the Virgin. The sketchy underdrawing and bravura painting of the Christ Child himself suggest that this passage at least was Titian’s work. The pose of the infant is close to the putto in the foreground of Raphael’s Triumph of Galatea (Farnesina, Rome) of c. 1512 and has the dynamism of the angels in Titian’s Assumption (Frari, Venice) of 1516–18.

The prominent coat of arms in the centre foreground appears to show a red and green brazier or beacon between two ornate red fountains on a golden yellow background. This is painted over the original arms which showed a red tower with crossed swords or sceptres. In about 1653 prints were commissioned from a number of engravers to record the Reymst collection and, at a later date, prints of the thirty-three paintings selected to be given to Charles II were gathered into a volume published in the latter part of the 1660s. The engraving and etching of the Titian painting is by Cornelis Visscher and in his print the coat of arms on the painting is a tower with what seems to be crossed sceptres. This has been identified as that of the Dalla Torre, an important family in Venice known to Titian. The same coat of arms also appears on one of several copies of the painting sold at Sotheby’s. The present coat of arms is yet to be identified, but must have been added after 1660, either before the painting was shipped to this country or once here, but before 1842 when Mrs Jameson records them.
62. **The Adoration of the Shepherds c. 1515–17**

Oil on panel  
73.6 x 120.3 cm  
**RCIN 402846**

**Provenance**
Acquired by Charles I from Mantua. A CR brand and label on the back now almost illegible: *From Mantua/1668/No. 153*, but not identified in the documents of either collection. Probably recorded in Charles II inventory c.1666–7 at Whitehall and in James II inventory 1688.

**References**

Giovanni Cariani was born near Bergamo but had moved to Venice by 1508. It is not known where he trained but his early work shows the influence of Giovanni Bellini and the poetic subject matter of Giorgione and artists in his circle – Sebastiano del Piombo, Titian and Palma Vecchio. Cariani was in Bergamo to execute his first securely dated work for the Church of San Gottardo, *The Virgin and Child with Joseph and Other Saints* of 1517 (Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan); he remained there until 1523, when he returned to Venice.¹

This painting was attributed to Giorgione until Crowe and Cavalcaselle suggested Cariani as the artist; most subsequent scholars have agreed with this, with the exception of Pallucchini and Rossi.² The painting has been abraded, probably in the nineteenth century, but much of the detail is still intact and shows the distinctive qualities of Cariani’s work.³

It seems likely that Cariani decided to paint over the group of angels in the clouds top left, although a subsequent restoration partially revealed one of them once more.⁴ The pronounced craquelure in this area has resulted from the artist painting an upper layer before the previous one had dried, as he re-worked his ideas. The lower angels, crowding around the Virgin, seem to have been planned from the start, as Cariani left a reserve for them. The composition is eccentric, with the tightly knit group of participants crowded together in the foreground in front of a distant view of a lake with hills beyond. In the right middle ground two more shepherds receive the news of Christ’s birth, from earthbound angels. Shearman suggested that the painting began life as a *Rest on the Flight into Egypt*, to which shepherds were later added. This would explain the hillside setting, which is most unusual for an Adoration, but there is no technical evidence to support the hypothesis.

The long horizontal format and the tendency to overlap figures in the foreground plane are characteristic of Cariani’s work of this early period, and can be seen in *The Concert of c.1515–16* (National Museum, Warsaw). The dreamy sense of isolation of each participant, despite their close proximity to one another, recalls the enigmatic quality of Giorgione’s work. Many similar details of gesture and costume can be found in Cariani’s *Virgin and Child with Saints and Donors* commissioned in 1514 (private collection, Bergamo) and his San Gottardo altarpiece of 1517.⁵ In all these paintings colour is strong, with dazzling highlights laid on with fine touches of thick paint. The energetic angels resemble those in the fragment of *Adoration of the Shepherds* of 1518–20 (Brera); the shepherds and animals on the right are angular and summarily painted like the soldiers in the background of the *Resurrection of Christ* of 1520 (Brera). Cariani’s *Virgin between Sts Rock and John the Baptist* (private collection, Bologna) of c.1516–18 is most comparable in subject and arrangement, although it is closer to the balanced compositions of Titian.⁶

The landscape background here must be based on the hilly countryside around Bergamo, recording one of the lakes, such as the Lago d’Iseo, and possibly the river Brembo. The river Brembo has also been proposed as the inspiration for the background of the *Rest on the Flight into Egypt with St Anne* of 1520–23 (private collection, Bergamo).⁷ The weir on the right and the sense of distant countryside occur much more prominently in Cariani’s *Woman in a Landscape* of c.1520–22 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin).

It has been suggested that this *Adoration of the Shepherds* reveals the impact of northern art: the influence of German prints is clearly apparent in later Cariani paintings of the late 1520s, such as *The Way to Calvary* (Pinacoteca Ambrosiana, Milan). The angular poses of the figures and the nervous quality of the highlights here suggest that Cariani may have been looking at German art at this earlier date. The landscape recalls the Netherlandish and German landscape tradition, in particular the so-called *Weltlandschaften* (‘world panoramas’) of Joachim Patinir, which had such an influence on north Italian art of this period.⁸

---

¹ Pallucchini and Rossi 1983 for Cariani’s career and literature. See also Penny 2004, pp. 37–47.
³ The painting was probably overcleaned before the mid-nineteenth century. Shearman (1983) has suggested that the reeds on the left were early additions.
⁴ Early photographs show the angels covered by clouds before the most recent restoration in the twentieth century. Areas of pink on the left may be evidence of further angels.
⁵ Pallucchini and Rossi 1983, nos. 23, 55 and 79.
⁶ Pallucchini and Rossi 1983, nos. 30, 54 and 56.
GIROLAMO ROMANINO  
Brescia c.1484–7 – c.1560

63. Portrait of a Man c.1515–17

Oil on panel  
82.1 × 68.9 cm  
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Bought by Prince Albert from Nicholls, May 1846
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Prince Albert acquired this portrait as a Giorgione and included it in his display of early Italian painting in his Dressing and Writing Room at Osborne House. In 1990 Lionel Cast proposed an attribution to the Brescian artist Girolamo Romanino, whose work is very rare in this country. It is now generally accepted as one of Romanino’s earliest portraits, dated c. 1515–17.3

Recent conservation has revealed that the painting is in somewhat better condition than was once believed.3 There is a vertical split, with very slight paint loss along its edge, running from top to centre, passing through the sitter’s left eye. An irregular horizontal break (in line with the sitter’s upper arms) has caused a slight disruption in the surface plane but very little paint loss. John Shearman suggested that all the edges had been cut and that the portrait may have been more vertical in format, even perhaps including the sitter’s hands.4 Recent examination has revealed that, while the panel has indeed been planed on the left, the edges are essentially original. It is unlikely that significant areas of panel have been removed, unless the original portrait was lopped in composition or unusually elongated vertically. As it stands, the figure fills the space in much the same way as the subject of the Portrait of a Man of c.1520 (Pinacoteca Tosio-Martinengo, Brescia) attributed to Romanino. The area of shadow in the niche has become more transparent with age, emphasising the grey, loosely indicated brushstrokes.

Romanino established an independent workshop in Brescia in 1508, but very little is known of his first twenty years. His style was strongly influenced by Giorgione and Titian, and by Lombard and German artists, especially Dürer, whose work was probably known to Romanino in print form. The powerful expressionism of his four celebrated Passion frescoes of 1519–20, in the nave of the Duomo at Cremona, is indebted to such northern influences. Giorgione and Titian are the main influences seen in the current work, in the softly modelled face and fine hair of the moustache, contrasted with the rich and varied textures of the clothes. Similar features appear in the handful of other portraits by Romanino to have survived, such as the slightly earlier, assertively frontal, Portrait of a Man in Armour (c.1514; Museum of Art, New Orleans) and the later, more tortuous Portrait of a Man (c.1521; Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest). The present portrait can be dated by comparison with these works and the similarly featured St Roch in the small altarpiece The Virgin between St Louis and St Roch of c.1517 (Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Berlin).

The sitter in the Royal Collection portrait wears a wide-brimmed hat over a gold-decorated scacciotto, a close-fitting coif or cap, usually made of leather or fabric, worn by soldiers in the early sixteenth century to keep their shoulder-length hair out of the way.5 A similar combination of scacciotto, large-brimmed hat, ribbons and ostrich feathers is seen in Romanino’s Cremona frescoes mentioned above.6 In his Salome (Bodemuseum, Berlin) of the same date (c.1516–17) an ostrich feather sweeps around Salome’s forehead. Ballarin has suggested that the extraordinary hat in the Royal Collection portrait may have been inspired by prints by the German artist Altdorfer.7

The green and gold garment on the man’s left shoulder is difficult to decipher. Over it he wears a doublet or possibly a saione, a wide-skirted garment here decorated with gold bands. Similar saioni are seen in Raphael’s Mass of Bolsena (Stanza d’Eliodoro, Vatican), and Romanino’s Crowning of Thorns (Cremona Cathedral). To imitate the gold edging of the saione the artist seems to have painted a yellow glaze on top of silver leaf, which was then decorated with details pre fixed to a belt. The sitter was probably a north Italian nobleman rather than a professional soldier, since the latter were usually depicted with more armour and weapons. The badge worn on his right sleeve is rare and yet to be identified; it may indicate that he belonged to a confraternity or order of chivalry similar to the Venetian Compagnie della Calza.

1 The only other paintings by Romanino in this country in public collections are the magnificent altarpiece The Nativity with Sts Alexander, Jerome, Filippo Benizzi and Gaudioso (National Gallery, London) and The Judgement of Midas (Christ Church, Oxford); Penny 2004, pp. 315–31; Nova 1994, nos. 39 and 10.
4 Shearman 1983, p. 214. The belief that the preparation of the panel was thicker below the horizontal split led Shearman to propose that Romanino had reused a panel, scraping off an earlier painting. Recent x-radiography has revealed no trace of an earlier composition under the present one.
6 The author is indebted to Jane Bridgeman for her assistance with the costume and Gabriele Neher and Alessandro Nova for their suggestions. Bridgeman’s dating of the costume to c.1511–18 is consistent with that of the portrait proposed here. She has also pointed out that the lute player in Cariani’s Concert (c.1518–20; National Gallery of Art, Washington dc) has a hat tied up with ribbon.
7 Ballarin in Paris 1993, p. 445; Hollstein 1954, i, p. 198. See Altdorfer’s Footsoldier with a Sword (1506); The Drummer (1510); Footsoldier Playing a Flute (1510); Standard-bearer and Woman with Feather Hat (1506–8); Large Standard-bearer (1506 or 1508).
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64. Portrait of a Bearded Man c.1515–18

Oil on canvas
53.6 × 40.0 cm
rcin 405753

PROVENANCE
From the collection of Gerard Reynst, Amsterdam; possibly the portrait seen there by Arnoldus Buchelius, September 1639; acquired by the States of Holland and West Friesland and presented to Charles II, 1660

REFERENCE
Shearman 1983, no. 142

Lorenzo Lotto was born in Venice and his early work shows the influence of Alvise Vivarini and Giovanni Bellini. He travelled extensively throughout his career, spending the last years of his life as a lay brother at the Santa Casa religious community in Loreto. He is first recorded painting in Treviso in 1503 but left there in 1506 for Recanati in the Marches and in 1509 he was in Rome, where he frescoed some rooms in the Vatican Palace for Pope Julius II. In 1511 he was back in the Marches with commissions for altarpieces. There followed two successful and settled periods in his career: from 1513 to 1525 in Bergamo, where he executed many important commissions, including the high altarpiece for the church of Santi Stefano and Domenico; and from 1525 to 1532 in Venice, where he continued to supply paintings to Bergamo and the Marches. He was one of the most inventive and idiosyncratic painters of the sixteenth century and a serious rival of Titian, Palma Vecchio and Pordenone. In his sensitive and searching portraits his sitters return our gaze with unnerving directness.

This man with dark, almost shoulder-length hair, pulled back behind his ears, and a long, paler moustache wears a black silk quilted doublet (possibly an arming doublet to be worn under armour) over a white chemise. He appears at first to be confronting the viewer full face, which gives his portrait a directness and his expression a look of disdain or assertiveness. In fact, he faces slightly left, his left ear more visible than his right, but his head is tilted and he gazes to the right. The portrait was restored shortly before 1868 and it has recently been conserved.1

Given to Giorgione in early inventories and to Titian in 1818, it was first recognised as a Lotto by Richard Redgrave, an attribution which was widely, if not universally, accepted, but which has more recently been questioned.2 Restoration has revealed that the portrait has the clarity and subtle modelling of Lotto's work: the way in which the colour of the sitter's paler moustache contrasts with his darker hair, the tactile effect of the soft, silk doublet. The handling of paint is comparable with the later Andrea Odoni (no. 66). The technique is not as rigidly precise as Lotto's early portraits, such as the Bishop Bernardino de' Rossi (Capodimonte, Naples) of c.1504–5 and the Young Man with the Lamp (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) of c.1506. The near-frontal view of the sitter's face has been compared with Lotto's Giovanni Agostino della Torre and his Son Niccolò (National Gallery, London; fig. 93), dating from c.1513–16 when longer hair was in fashion. Few portraits by Lotto survive from this period for comparison, another example being the Portrait of a Man with a Rosary (Nivaagaard Malerisamling, Nivå). The carefully structured foreshortened head of the Bearded Man is closest to that of Niccolò in the National Gallery portrait, who was added in to the portrait of his father.3

Albrecht Dürer visited Italy in 1494–5 and again in 1505–7, and there has been much debate about the exchange of influence between Italian and northern European artists. Pope-Hennessy suggested that Lotto had seen Dürer's Self-portrait of c.1500 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich) when he painted this portrait, because it shows a more advanced use of light and shade than his earlier full-frontal portraits such as his Portrait of a Youth (Accademia Carrara, Bergamo) and Portrait of a Youth (Uffizi). The other full-frontal portrait by Dürer is that of Osvolt Krel (1499; Alte Pinakothek, Munich). However, although Lotto knew Dürer's work, particularly his prints, he could not have seen these particular paintings. There was already a strong tradition of full-frontal portraiture in northern Italy, as seen in the work of Antonello da Messina and Alvise Vivarini, before the arrival of Dürer; Lotto's use of the full-frontal pose here, which gives this portrait such focused intensity, does recall Dürer's work but with a Venetian softening of contours. This precision and immediacy create an image far removed from the aristocratic reserve of Titian's sitters; these characteristics were taken up by later Lombard artists, such as Giovanni Battista Moroni.

1 Redgrave sheet, 'lined lately', dated 18 February (?) 1868, Surveyor's Office, St James's Palace. The latest conservation was carried out by Anna Sandén.
2 Ascribed to Lotto by Crowe and Cavalcaselle (1871, ii, p. 159). Shearman (1983, p. 143) summarised previous scholarly opinion: the attribution to Lotto was accepted by Berenson; Logan (dated c.1508); Pignatti (1953, p. 76, dated c.1515–16) and Pope-Hennessy (dated c.1510); it was rejected by Longhi, Banti and Borsccheto, who proposed Oliverio, and questioned by Canova. Ballarin and Romani reject the attribution and Humfrey doubts it (informal communications with the author).

Fig. 93. Lorenzo Lotto, Portrait of Giovanni Agostino della Torre and his Son Niccolò (National Gallery, London; fig. 193), dating from c.1513–16 when longer hair was in fashion. Few portraits by Lotto survive from this period for comparison, another example being the Portrait of a Man with a Rosary (Nivaagaard Malerisamling, Nivå). The carefully structured foreshortened head of the Bearded Man is closest to that of Niccolò in the National Gallery portrait, who was added in to the portrait of his father.3

Albrecht Dürer visited Italy in 1494–5 and again in 1505–7, and there has been much debate about the exchange of influence between Italian and northern European artists. Pope-Hennessy suggested that Lotto had seen Dürer's Self-portrait of c.1500 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich) when he painted this portrait, because it shows a more advanced use of light and shade than his earlier full-frontal portraits such as his Portrait of a Youth (Accademia Carrara, Bergamo) and Portrait of a Youth (Uffizi). The other full-frontal portrait by Dürer is that of Osvolt Krel (1499; Alte Pinakothek, Munich). However, although Lotto knew Dürer's work, particularly his prints, he could not have seen these particular paintings. There was already a strong tradition of full-frontal portraiture in northern Italy, as seen in the work of Antonello da Messina and Alvise Vivarini, before the arrival of Dürer; Lotto's use of the full-frontal pose here, which gives this portrait such focused intensity, does recall Dürer's work but with a Venetian softening of contours. This precision and immediacy create an image far removed from the aristocratic reserve of Titian's sitters; these characteristics were taken up by later Lombard artists, such as Giovanni Battista Moroni.

1 Redgrave sheet, 'lined lately', dated 18 February (?) 1868, Surveyor's Office, St James's Palace. The latest conservation was carried out by Anna Sandén.
2 Ascribed to Lotto by Crowe and Cavalcaselle (1871, ii, p. 159). Shearman (1983, p. 143) summarised previous scholarly opinion: the attribution to Lotto was accepted by Berenson; Logan (dated c.1508); Pignatti (1953, p. 76, dated c.1515–16) and Pope-Hennessy (dated c.1510); it was rejected by Longhi, Banti and Borsccheto, who proposed Oliverio, and questioned by Canova. Ballarin and Romani reject the attribution and Humfrey doubts it (informal communications with the author).
ATTRIBUTED TO LORENZO LOTTO
Venice c.1480 – Loreto 1556/7

65. Portrait of a Man Holding a Glove c.1518–25

Oil on canvas
58.8 × 47.7 cm
RCIN 404428

PROVENANCE
Acquired by Frederick, Prince of Wales, 1731, from the Capel collection (red wax seal lower right corner)

REFERENCE
Shearman 1983, no. 144

This man, holding a glove in his left hand, directs a hard stare back at us over his shoulder as he moves away, as if we have proved to be a startling and unwelcome intrusion. His direct stare from slightly bloodshot eyes has been interpreted as baleful and even full of bilious rage.\(^1\) Lotto derived the idea of a figure looking over his shoulder from a design of Giorgione, known today through a later version in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich (fig. 94). Giorgione in turn seems here to have been influenced by the writings and portraits of Leonardo da Vinci.\(^2\)

The meticulous realism of Lotto’s technique adds to the immediacy and communicative power of the portrait. The subject’s hand is thinly and freely painted, as is the gleam of his white collar at his neck and through the slit at his shoulder.

Like his fellow Venetians, Lotto did not draw his designs carefully on his painted surfaces; infra-red reflectography reveals no underdrawing here. Adjustments were made once the painting was begun: the man’s head was originally turned a little more to face the viewer, so that he did not glance back as dramatically as he does in the final version; the pupil of his left eye was painted closer to his nose at first, and slightly higher; the position of the hat has also been altered.

As Shearman has pointed out, it was probably the use of Giorgione’s turning pose that led nineteenth-century scholars to attribute this painting to Giorgione. It was subsequently ascribed to Dosso Dossi, Savoldo, Palma Vecchio, Cariani and Altobello Melone. Philip Pouncey suggested that it was by Lorenzo Lotto in 1942; this was accepted by Nicholson and Berenson, and the painting was lent to the Royal Academy in 1946 as by Lotto.\(^3\) It is Lotto’s focused directness, his searching precision in capturing his sitter’s features and concentration on particular details such as, in this painting, the bloodshot eyes that seem to confirm the attribution; it can be compared to the double portrait Giovanni Agostino della Torre and his Son Niccolò of c.1513–16 (National Gallery, London; see fig. 93).\(^4\)

The hair length and hat can be compared with those worn in Carpaccio’s Dispute of St Stephen (1514; Brera). Other details such as the sleeve and fastening at the neck may date the portrait later. The man’s hand in the Royal Collection portrait was always thinly painted, without much form. The loose touch here and in the fur of his coat, the folds of his white chemise, are uncharacteristic of Lotto’s style and led Shearman to be cautious in his attribution; yet the free manipulation of paint for the white chemise can be found in his later portraits, for example at neck and cuffs in the Portrait of a Young Man of c.1530 (Accademia, Venice). By this date Lotto’s portraits were generally on a larger format and the sitters three-quarter length, as in the portrait of Andrea Odoni of 1527 (no. 66). The graduation of light on the background from cool light top left to deep shadow behind the figure, and the shape of his cast shadow, place the portrait later than the National Gallery portrait of della Torre and closer to that of Odoni.

Similar effects can also be found in Lotto’s major altarpieces of the early 1520s, such as The Virgin and Child with Saints (San Bernardino in Pignolo, Bergamo) of 1521.\(^5\)

---

3 ‘A splendid thing … seems to me a perfectly good Lorenzo Lotto’ (letter from Philip Pouncey, February 1942, in the Royal Collection picture files; Shearman 1983, p. 148). Pignatti (1953) does not accept the attribution. Ballarin and Romano reject the attribution and Humfrey doubts it, possibly in favour of Cariani (informal communications with the author). The Redgrave sheet dated 27 February 1867 records that the painting was ‘lately repaired by Pinti’; it was cleaned in 1942.
4 Penny 2004, pp. 52–64.
5 Berenson dated the painting 1515–20, Shearman c.1520.
LORENZO LOTTO
Venice c.1480–Loreto 1556/7

66. **Portrait of Andrea Odoni 1527**

Oil on canvas
104.6 × 116.6 cm
Inscribed: *Laurentius lotus/ 1527*
RCIN 405776

**PROVENANCE**
Andrea Odoni, recorded by Marcantonio Michiel, 1532; Alvise Odoni (sister’s brother) before 1555; Lucas van Uffelen probably by 1623; Gerard Reynst, 1639; States of Holland and West Friesland for presentation to Charles II, 1660

**REFERENCES**

This portrait of the successful Venetian merchant Andrea Odoni (1488–1545) is one of the most innovative and dynamic portraits of the Italian Renaissance by Lorenzo Lotto, recently returned to Venice after thirteen years in Bergamo and anxious to impress possible patrons in Venice. The portrait has aptly been described as one of the finest and most ambitious of all of Lotto’s portraits and a deliberate challenge to Titian’s supremacy in the field. The portrait was recorded in the owner’s bedroom in his house on the Fondamenta del Gaffero by Marcantonio Michiel when he visited the collection in 1532. Vasari mentions the portrait ‘che è molto bello’, which he must have seen when he visited Venice ten years later. The painting was also included in the 1555 inventory of his brother and heir, Alvise Odoni. The son of a wealthy recent Milanese immigrant to the city, Andrea Odoni was an important member of the cittadini. He built upon the collection which he had inherited from his uncle, Francesco Zio, to become a renowned collector of paintings, sculpture, antique vases, coins, gems and natural history specimens. This portrait was hung in Odoni’s bedroom alongside religious and profane paintings: a reclining nude by Savoldo, and paintings by Palma Vecchio and Titian (possibly *The Virgin and Child with the Infant St John and a Female Saint or Donor*, now in the National Gallery, London, and the prototype of no. 61). The house also contained an unusual combination of ancient and modern statuary, with ‘mutilated and lacerated antique marble heads and other figures’. Pietro Aretino wrote to Odoni (in a letter of 1538) that he had re-created Rome in Venice, though elsewhere he describes the splendours of the house in a tone that suggests it overstepped the boundaries of Venetian decorum. Vasari called Odoni’s house ‘a friendly haven for men of talent’.

The sculpture in the present painting has been identified as versions, probably plaster casts, of well-known originals. There are three representations of Hercules: *Hercules and Antaeus*; the standing figure with a lionskin identified at the time as Emperor Commodus as Hercules; and *Hercules Mingens* on the far right. There are two representations of Venus: the torso in the foreground (possibly *Venus Victrix*), and a Bathing Venus. In the foreground there is also a cast of the bust of Hadrian (Museo Nazionale, Naples). Odoni holds out a statuette of Diana or Artemis of the Ephesians in his right hand. Of these only Hadrian’s bust is known to have been in Odoni’s collection, as it appears in his brother Alvise Odoni’s inventory. It has been suggested that the others were not in Odoni’s collection, but rather belonged to Lotto: we know from Lotto’s wills and account book that he owned plaster and wax reliefs and sculpture in gesso. The fragments must have been included in the painting because they were important to Odoni, or as a symbolic commentary on him. Although the originals from which they were copied are likely to have been fragments, their battered state seems to have been emphasised by Lotto and their arrangement challenging and ironic, the *Hercules Mingens* placed facing the Bathing Venus, the torso of Venus in the foreground against the bust of Hadrian.

It has always been recognised that the meaning of this painting is more complex than simply a portrait of a collector, and that a particular meaning must have been intended, but this continues to be much debated. Odoni’s direct gaze at the viewer and the contrast between the hand held to his heart and the proffered statuette of Diana have suggested to scholars that a choice is being proposed to the viewer. The contrast between this complete object, symbol of nature or earth, and the antique fragments has been seen as representing the enduring power of nature compared with the transitory character of art and human endeavour, one of many interpretations on the theme of nature and art that have been put forward. The most recent conservation has revealed a cross, held by Odoni against his chest with his left hand. Humfrey suggests that for Odoni the true religion of Christianity, represented by the golden cross, will always take precedence over nature and the gods of pagan antiquity, symbolised by the statuette of Diana and the other classical fragments. Lotto had included the figure of the many-breasted Diana of Ephesus to signify David’s idolatrous love for Bathsheba in two of his intarsia designs for the choir stalls of Santa Maria Maggiore in Bergamo, on which he was working at the same time. He may well also have seen Raphael’s use of the same figures on the throne of Philosophy in the Stanza della Segnatura ceiling fresco in the Vatican. It has also been proposed that Lotto intended a relationship between the bust of the Emperor Hadrian, the great patron of the arts in ancient Rome, and Odoni as the new patron of the arts. It has been noticed recently that Michiel changed his description of the painting from ‘with ancient marble fragments’ to ‘who contemplates ancient marble fragments’, and two scholars have suggested that rather than being about one choice the painting is a meditation on many themes related to collecting.

Andrea Odoni chose an unconventional artist to create an innovative portrait. Lotto had used a broad (here in fact nearly square) rather than vertical format already, but here it is used to fill the space around the sitter. Odoni’s gaze is made more arresting by his powerful gesture, bulked out by his coat, and the weight of sculpture around him. Parmigianino’s *Portrait of a Man of c.1524* (National Gallery, London) precedes Lotto’s work, but with this painting Lotto seems to have created the archetypal portrait of a collector in a furnished setting. Lotto is always psychologically penetrating and here, newly returned to Venice, he successfully challenges his great rival, Titian. Titian’s *Jacopo Strada* of 1567–8 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna)
and Palma Giovane’s Portrait of a Collector of c.1595 (Birmingham City Museum and Art Gallery) are two notable examples of the influence of the present portrait in Italy.

The portrait was shipped to Amsterdam by the Flemish merchant Lucas van Uffelen, who was depicted by Van Dyck in c.1623 in a portrait which is a conscious tribute to Lotto (Metropolitan Museum, New York). Rembrandt also seems to have known Lotto’s Andrea Odoni: its influence can be traced in two of his portraits of 1641, Saskia with a Flower (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden) and Cornelis Anslo and his Wife (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin), and his etching of Jan Lutma the Elder of 1656.

4 Battilotti and Franco 1978, p. 82.
6 Michiel, Notizia, 2000 edn, p. 52, describes the interior of Odoni’s house.
11 Brown (B.L.) 2005, pp. 22–3. The author is grateful to Beverly Brown for her assistance on this subject.
13 The cross was visible in photographs before the treatment in 1953 and in the Cornelis Visscher engraving, Logan (A.M.) 1979, p. 130. It was revealed once again in the most recent treatment (1996–7) by Rupert Featherstone.
14 Cortesi Bosco 1987, i, pp. 425–6, 428.
15 Humfrey 1997, p. 163, and Martin (A.J.) 2000, pp. 164–7. Close examination reveals that only in this area of the painting are there sweeping planning lines and indications that the bust was not there from the start, but it was not added as an after-thought as Shearman suggested. There is evidence of pink paint under the head.
Portraiture of Man with a Hawk c.1510–15

Oil on panel
61.2 x 47.0 cm
RCIN 405764

PROVENANCE
On the back a label, now partly covered, which Redgrave read as From Mantua 1631, No. 37; part of Charles I’s collection; valued at £5 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to Wright on 21 May 1650; recovered at the Restoration
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This sculptural and intensely naturalistic portrait shows a man feeding a sparrowhawk. His hollow cheeks, the slight bump under his lip and the wart under his left eye are unflinchingly recorded. The ruddy, leathery texture of his skin recalls that of Savoldo’s Hermit Saints St Anthony and St Paul of 1520 (Accademia, Venice) and his Elijah Fed by the Raven of c. 1515–20 (National Gallery of Art, Washington DC). While the man’s face, hair and shirt are intact, the area where the hawk was painted is damaged and much of the bird was reconstructed when the painting was restored in 1969–72. The beautifully painted linen collar of the shirt has the attention to detail, specifically of cloth, found in Savoldo’s early works, and can be compared with the fine edging of the Virgin’s chemise in the Virgin Adoring the Child with St Jerome and St Francis (Galleria Sabauda, Turin; see fig. 96). The sharp clarity of the portrait differs from Savoldo’s later works such as his lyrical and atmospheric Shepherd with a Flute of c.1525 (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles).

The portrait in the Louvre of Bernardo di Salla (fig. 95) has a pose very similar to this one and entered the Louvre at the same time as a Portrait of a Woman of identical size. These two portraits have been considered to be of the same person and variously attributed to Buonconsiglio, Lorenzo Costa, Boltraffio, Lorenzo Lotto, Alvise Vivarini and even (by analogy with no, 67) to Savoldo. Recently the signature of Francesco Caroto has been discovered on the back of Savoldo’s portrait. The writer Paolo Pino, who was Savoldo’s pupil, wrote: ‘I do not … wish our painter to become ensnared in things other than the painting of the figure in imitation of nature, but this should be his foundation’.


2 Infra-red reflectography has revealed some underdrawing on the face, the hands, the folds of the man’s coat and the hawk, but not to the extent of no. 68.

3 Béguin 1985, pp. 37–44.


GIROLAMO SAVOLDO
Brescia c.1480–Venice 1548

68. The Virgin Adoring the Child with Two Donors c.1527

Oil on canvas
102.2 × 139.7 cm

Inscribed on the wall, top right: [m] Hi [ero]n[i]m[a]/Savoldus d./ Br[esi]a faciebat/. . .1
RCIN 400755

PROVENANCE
Possibly the picture from Charles I’s collection appraised at £60 on 8 September 1649; recorded in Charles I’s inventory, c.1666–7, Whitehall
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This is a rare example of a signed and dated painting by Savoldo.2 The signature was revealed by a restoration recorded in 1867, at which point the date was read as 1527; restoration work carried out in 1909 suggested that these numbers were strengthened (or even added) a century earlier; the date is now indecipherable. If the 1527 was an accurate reading of an original date, as some have suggested, then it is not inconsistent with the style of the painting.3 Shearman dated it to the mid-1520s on the grounds of the similarity of the female donor’s headdress to that in the Licinio Family Group (no. 71) of 1524; it is also close to a Licinio portrait in the Borghese Gallery, Rome, which is generally dated slightly later.4 The concentrated colours of the drapery with the glossy metallic effect of folds, particularly in the veil of the Virgin, are typical of Savoldo’s work in the late 1520s, such as his St Jerome (National Gallery, London) commissioned in 1527.

There is a closely related painting in the Galleria Sabauda, Turin, in which the two donors are replaced by St Jerome and St Francis (fig. 96).5 Both paintings have been x-radiographed and in both cases changes have occurred during the painting process, which suggests that neither one is a mechanical copy of the other.6 In the Royal Collection version there is extensive fluid underdrawing with the brush, visible to the naked eye in places and elsewhere through infra-red analysis. The Virgin’s face was defined with heavy lines, as if following a cartoon, but the donors’ faces have lighter, more searching lines. Originally the face of the woman on the right lacked the double chin, which now creates such a striking impression of down-to-earth realism by comparison with that of the Virgin. The drapery in this painting is softer than in the Turin version and the light suggestive of late afternoon rather than evening, as it falls from high up on the left, casting complex shadows and creating a more powerful sense of space.

It is now generally agreed that the Turin painting came first, particularly because the gesture of lifting the cloth to reveal the Christ Child seems more appropriate for a saint, especially Jerome, translator of the Bible, (as in that version) than a donor (as here): it is usually the Virgin who lifts the Christ Child’s bedcover in this way to reveal him to his worshippers (see Carracci, Il Silenzio, no. 90). The action has been seen as a premonition of the shroud covering the dead Christ. Shearman even suggests that the unknown donor here might have been called Giuseppe (Joseph) and the action chosen to allude to Joseph of Arimathea who helped at Christ’s entombment.7 Savoldo married a Flemish widow, Maria di Tijlandrija, possibly after 1527, and frequently incorporated compositional details from northern sources into his work. The distant vista and the close observation of natural details here reflect his interest in Netherlandish and German art, in particular the airy landscapes of Joachim Patinir. There are similarities between this composition and that of the Nativity of c.1480 by Jean Hey (Master of Moulins) (Musée Rolin, Autun), in which a praying donor and Virgin adore the Christ Child.8

1 The letters in brackets are hypothetical reconstructions.
5 The Turin painting has been dated much earlier or later than no. 68. Gilbert 1986, 1512–16; Boschetto 1965, after 1525; Stradiotti in Brescia 1990, no. 1, 15, early 1520s; Frangi 1992, c.1525. The Turin canvas is almost exactly the same size (90 × 137 cm). Compared with the Royal Collection painting it looks as if it has been cut at the lower edge.
6 In the Royal Collection painting the wall on the right was lower; the church had a large circular window; there is a round shape above the Virgin’s hands; Christ’s foot has been lengthened and the male donor’s left shoulder was higher. In the Turin painting there are alternative outlines for the elbow of St Jerome, his right hand and the hands of the Child. The author is grateful to Paola Astra for her assistance. See also Tardito Amerio 1985, pp. 61–4.
7 Gilbert 1986, pp. 533–4, and in London 1983b, no. 87; Shearman 1983, p. 222.
Palma Vecchio (Jacopo Palma) Serina, nr Bergamo c.1480–Venice 1528

69. A Sibyl c.1522–4

Oil on panel
71.7 x 54.3 cm
RCIN 405763

Provenance
Presented to Charles II by Edward Montagu, 1st Earl of Sandwich
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Jacopo Palma the Elder (usually called Palma Vecchio) moved from the Bergamo region to Venice by 1510 and he remained there for the rest of his career. He may have trained with a fellow Bergamasque artist, Andrea Previtali, or with Francesco di Simone da Santacroce, although his early work recalls that of Giovanni Bellini. The example of Titian inspired his later compositions, which have a new dynamism and poetic mood. He was the great-uncle of Jacopo Palma the Younger, ‘il Giovane’ (see no. 78).

The two paintings by him included here illustrate his specialties, which he established as themes for Venetian art of the period: seductive but idealised female half-lengths and the Virgin and saints in a landscape setting (sometimes called ‘sacre conversazioni’).

This is one of two autograph versions of this design; the other, now in the Fondazione Sorlini, Brescia (see fig. 97), also has a distinguished provenance, having been in the collections of Queen Christina of Sweden (in 1632), Philippe, Duc d’Orléans (in 1722) and the Duke of Bridgewater.1 The Sorlini version has the same dimensions, but is more highly finished and thickly painted; the woman’s face is broader, she has fuller locks with flowers in her hair, she shows more of the cuff of her chemise around her left hand, and her nipple is more pronounced. The execution is more summary: the cuffs are simple strokes of white, without the gatherings of the Royal Collection version; her right hand is hastily indicated, with none of the subtle modelling found here; and the range of dark to light and use of colour is more restricted.

The artist laid a grey layer on a creamy white gesso ground and used this as a base colour or imprimatura for the flesh. This technique must have been typical for Palma: the unfinished portrait of a woman known as ‘Paola Priuli’ in the Pinacoteca Querini-Stampalia, Venice, has a grey ground to which pink has been added to start modelling the face; the unfinished right hand of the so-called ‘Francesco Querini’, also in the Querini-Stampalia, has similar areas of grey.2 In both versions of the Sibyl the area of the chemise in shadow is suggested by leaving the grey underlayer untouched. The areas of flesh in the Royal Collection painting have an unfinished look compared with the Sorlini version, which cannot be the result of a lost glaze (although some surface details elsewhere, in the eyes and around her mouth, have been lost).3

X-radiography reveals slight changes to the composition, especially in the position and folds of the mantle around the sitter’s right hand.

Carlo Ridolfi recorded in 1648 that ‘Palma executed many portraits of women with antique-style [all’antica] dress and ornaments’.4 The Sibyl belongs to a group of paintings from the 1520s. The title is a nineteenth-century suggestion, based on the idea that the ‘arabic’ inscription (in fact a meaningless combination of letters) alludes to cryptic sibylline mysteries.5 The painting has been compared to Palma Vecchio’s A Blonde Woman of 1522–4 (National Gallery, London), featuring a similarly revealing chemise, loose blond hair and gesture of the hand. The type ultimately derives from Titian’s Flora of c.1515–20 (Uffizi), which was in turn inspired by Leonardo and Giorgione. But who are these Sibyls, Floras and nymphs in Titian’s and Palma’s work? They could be portraits of specific courtesans, or images of erotic beauty derived from classical and medieval literature and associated with courtesans. Palma’s Sibyl has dyed blonde hair with darker roots showing, perhaps recording the common practice at the time for courtesans to apply a liquid paste and bleach their hair in the sunlight.6 Courtesans throughout history have been given the names of pagan goddesses: Flora was a popular choice, but there was also one called ‘La Cumea’ (‘the Cumaean Sybil’) recorded in Venice at this time.7 But the ‘Bella Donna’ in the current work seems too generalised to be a portrait: all Palma’s women have similarly golden hair, full red mouth and fresh face. Here he has transformed the look of courtesans so much in favour at this time into an ideal erotic portrait of beauty to please the Venetian market for sensual images. The same features of ideal female beauty which were described in the poetry of Pietro Bembo and Pietro Aretino are visualised in Palma’s portraits.8

Fig. 97 Palma Vecchio, A Sibyl; oil on panel, 71.7 x 54.3 cm (Fondazione Sorlini, Brescia)

1 Oil on panel, 71.7 x 54.3 cm; Rylands 1988, p. 211; Rylands in Bergamo 2001, pp. 198–9; Pedrocco 2004, pp. 34–5.
2 Rylands, 1988, p. 247, no. 203; p. 217, no. 84.
3 The painting was conserved by the Hamilton Kerr Institute in 1978–9. There is a complete barba all the way around the painting, proving that this is the original size. There does not seem to be evidence of flowers in her hair as in the other version.
4 Ridolfi 1914–24, edn. i, p. 140.
5 Jameson 1842, p. 353.
8 Rylands 1988, pp. 94–6.
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70.  The Virgin and Child with Sts Catherine of Alexandria and John the Baptist c.1527–8
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This painting was in the collection of Charles I, but there is no documentary evidence that it was part of the Mantua sale.1 When it entered the collection the panel was thinned and laminated to a thin coniferous panel (3 mm) and then to an oak back panel (7 mm), to which a Charles I brand was applied. This treatment was complex, finely executed and highly unusual for this date. The losses along the grain of the panel may have been caused by this early restoration.4 The painting has a pronounced craquelure, resulting from the upper paint layers drying more quickly than the lower, but the jewel-like colour combinations have survived almost perfectly. Especially striking are the brilliant gold-orange and violet-blue in St Catherine’s drapery and the touches of gold at her neck and hair.

Palma Vecchio developed this successful formula of the Virgin and Child and saints seated in an idyllic landscape from more static, hierarchic half-length groups by earlier Venetians, such as Giovanni Bellini, and from compositions by Alvise Vivarini and Jacopo de Barbari treating such subjects as the ‘Madonna of Humility’ (where the Virgin sits on the ground), the Adoration of the Shepherds and the Rest on the Flight into Egypt. Palma was conservative with his theme, but was inspired by his more revolutionary contemporary, Titian, to develop more dynamic and focused compositions and to integrate his heroic, richly dressed figures into a poetic, sunlit landscape. The pastoral idyll was a Venetian speciality, seen elsewhere in the paintings of Giorgione and the poetry of Jacopo Sannazaro, Pietro Bembo and Fra Francesco Colonna.3 Palma reconfigured the figures to create many variations on this theme; these ‘sacre conversazioni’ were much in demand by the Venetian middle class for private devotion (or decoration) rather than as grand altarpieces in public churches. Andrea Odoni hung his portrait by Lotto (no. 66) beside a painting by Titian on the same theme in the ‘upper room’ (‘camera de sopra’) of his house in Venice.4

This is generally accepted as a fine autograph late work by the artist.3 The figure of John the Baptist had already appeared in two previous paintings: The Virgin with Sts Catherine, John the Baptist and two Female Saints (c. 1520–22; Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and The Virgin with Sts John the Baptist, Peter and a Female Saint of 1523–6 (Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum). This third appearance, however, is the most successful and complex. Rylands noted that the pose of the Christ Child derives from Lorenzo Luzzo’s Virgin Enthroned with Sts Stephen and Liberale (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) of 1511, painted for the church of Santo Stefano, Feltre, which also influenced Palma’s 1527–8 altarpiece in Santo Stefano, Vicenza.6 Compared with his earlier work, Palma designed this composition to be compact and focused. The interchange of glances between the two saints is intense, as Christ looks anxiously back at his mother, not wishing to accept the lamb, the symbol of his destiny, offered by St John.7 The broadly painted folds of drapery and softer transitions of planes, retaining intense colours, contrast with the more meticulous style and sharper folds of the larger Vienna painting. The ample sweeps of drapery recall those of Palma’s majestic figure of St Barbara in the church of Santa Maria Formosa, Venice, of the same date.

1 Rylands connects this work with the Gonzaga collection ‘Madonna’ by Palma Vecchio offered to Charles I on 17 October 1627, but this is more likely to be the same painting as ‘Una Madonna Palma vecchio con S. Rocco et S. Bastiano’ referred to in a similar list, dated 3 April 1627; Rylands 1988, p. 237; Luzzo 1913, pp. 140, 147.
2 Van der Doort mentions that the painting was ‘set upon a new board’ in his 1629 description. The painting was conserved in 1972–3 by Nancy Stocker upon a new board’ in his 1629 description. The painting has been dated to 1523–6 (Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum). This third appearance, however, is the most successful and complex. Rylands noted that the pose of the Christ Child derives from Lorenzo Luzzo’s Virgin Enthroned with Sts Stephen and Liberale (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) of 1511, painted for the church of Santo Stefano, Feltre, which also influenced Palma’s 1527–8 altarpiece in Santo Stefano, Vicenza. Compared with his earlier work, Palma designed this composition to be compact and focused. The interchange of glances between the two saints is intense, as Christ looks anxiously back at his mother, not wishing to accept the lamb, the symbol of his destiny, offered by St John. The broadly painted folds of drapery and softer transitions of planes, retaining intense colours, contrast with the more meticulous style and sharper folds of the larger Vienna painting. The ample sweeps of drapery recall those of Palma’s majestic figure of St Barbara in the church of Santa Maria Formosa, Venice, of the same date.
5 Shearman (1983, pp. 179–80) summarises previous opinions on authorship and date; more recently the painting has been dated to c. 1512 (Gombrich), c. 1523 (Freedberg) and 1527–8 (Rylands).
6 Rylands (1988, p. 237) draws attention to Palma’s contacts in Feltre at the end of his life. There is a pentiment where the Virgin’s left hand is held by that of Christ, a passage where Palma departs from his source. The pentiment of tree trunks behind the Virgin may also reflect this source.
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Bernardino Licinio was born in Venice but his family were from Poscante near Bergamo. He was probably trained in the workshop of Giovanni Bellini and his early work was much influenced by Giorgione. He established a successful workshop and from the 1520s he was engaged, like his rivals Titian, Palma Vecchio, Lorenzo Lotto and later Bonifazio de’ Pitati, in painting devotional paintings and portraits. Although he is documented in Venice throughout his career, and for the last time in 1549, he seems to have maintained connections with Bergamo and preserved the down-to-earth realism typical of Lombard painting, like his compatriots Giovanni Cariani (no. 62) and Girolamo Savoldo (no. 67).

Knowledge of Licinio’s work was obscured for four centuries because Vasari and Ridolfi confused him with a very different artist, Pordenone (c.1483/4 – 1539), Titian’s chief rival in Venice in the 1530s. It was only at the beginning of the twentieth century that Licinio’s oeuvre began to be clarified. This portrait was attributed to ‘Bordenon’ in the 1627 Mantua inventory of the Gonzaga collection, although Nys, who was negotiating to buy the collection on behalf of Charles I, recognised it as a Licinio and valued it at 300 scudi. It is now universally accepted as by Licinio, particularly because of its similarity to the signed portrait of Licinio’s elder brother Arrigo and his family in the Galleria Borghese in Rome.

In the nineteenth century it was thought that the portrait was of the artist and his own family, but there is no record even that Licinio married. The bringing together of so many portraits in one painting links this work (dated 1524) with the two other later examples by Licinio: Arrigo Licinio and his Family of c.1535 (Galleria Borghese; mentioned above) and Portrait of a Sculptor with Five Apprentices of the early 1530s (Duke of Northumberland, Alnwick Castle). These three paintings are justly regarded as Licinio’s most famous works.

The family is grouped around a magnificent Turkish table carpet, called a ‘small-patterned Holbein’ after its distinctive geometric pattern. Family groups by Lorenzo Lotto, his Portrait of a Married Couple of c.1524–5 (Hermitage; fig. 98) and Giovanni della Volta and Family of 1547 (National Gallery, London), are also grouped around table carpets. The two eldest children on the right of Licinio’s family group gaze back at the viewer, but the rest are involved in a dispute over the fruit on the table. The boy on the left, in elaborate striped hose, has selected an apple from the bowl against the wishes of his younger siblings; his father is adjudicating, watched by his wife. The aggrieved self-importance of the young daughter, who stands with arms akimbo nearest to the viewer, anxious to establish herself against her older siblings, rings true for any large family.

Apart from the drama of the fruit, it has been noted that the figures do not relate to each other psychologically, in contrast to the work of Licinio’s great rival, Lotto, whose portraits have a focused intensity. It has been suggested that there was a commemorative purpose to Licinio’s portraits and that their elegant inscriptions, in timeless classical lettering, play with ideas of the immortality of the painted likeness. In contrast, the grouping of an ordinary family here suggested to Mary Logan ‘the taste of a country photographer’. Licinio’s group portraits were preceded by Giovanni Cariani’s similarly realistic and

Fig. 98 Lorenzo Lotto, Portrait of a Married Couple; oil on canvas, 96 × 116 cm
(The State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg)
detailed group portrait, the *Seven Members of the Albani Family* (private collection) painted in Bergamo in 1519. His innovations in this area of portraiture in Venice may also have been part of the interchange of ideas with visiting Netherlandish and German artists: there is a close relationship between such Italian family portraits as this one and the *Portrait of a Family* of c. 1530 (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Kassel) now attributed to Maerten van Heemskerck.10

2 Ludwig 1903, pp. 44–57.
4 Della Pergola 1955–9, i, no. 207; London 1983b, no. 41; Bayer in New York 2004, no. 26; Vertova 1975, no. 96; Gregori 1991, p. 248. The Royal Collection painting has been recently conserved by Thérèse Prunet-Brewer. The herringbone weave of canvas is typically Venetian. A small stylised tree concludes the Roman numerals of the date. The painting was enlarged vertically in the eighteenth century and returned to its original dimensions shortly before Redgrave listed it on 9 April 1869.
5 Ludwig 1903.
6 Vertova 1975, nos. 1, 96.
9 Logan (M.) 1894, p. 25.
72. The Adoration of the Shepherds c. 1546

Oil on canvas
139.1 × 218.5 cm
RCIN 405772

Provenance
Acquired by Charles I; possibly identical with the picture from Charles I’s collection, Wimbledon, ‘The Nativity of Christ per Bassano’; valued at £35 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to De Critz; recovered at the Restoration; James II inventory 1688

References
Shearman 1983, no. 16; Bassano del Grappa 1992, no. 17

During his long career Jacopo Bassano visited Venice and other local towns but after 1540 lived in the family house in his home town of Bassano del Grappa, about thirty miles north-west of Venice in the foothills of the Dolomites, and directed his workshop there. His style developed continuously, combining the influence of Titian and northern European prints with a particularly direct observation of nature. As here, his town at the foot of Monte Grappa frequently formed the background of his works.1

As is usual in Renaissance art, the birth of Christ takes place within a ruined temple, a symbol of the Old Dispensation (Judaism), which had been superseded by the birth of the Redeemer and the New Dispensation (Christianity); its stones would be used to construct the new church and New Jerusalem. The classical column here stands for the decay of paganism, but is also included in the Meditations Vitae Christi: ‘At midnight on Sunday, when the hour of birth came, the Virgin rose and stood erect against a column’. The goat, which is an unusual animal to be included so prominently in this subject, was added along with the tree (possibly prefiguring the death of Christ on the Cross) after the decision was made to paint over a fourth shepherd. The goat was a symbol of sin or lust; there is also a description in the Book of Leviticus (16: 5–22) of a goat being sacrificed, while a second goat was driven into the wilderness – a scapegoat – to atone for the sins of Israel, thus becoming an Old Testament prefiguration of Christ who carries the sins of the world.2

This is one of about twenty-four paintings by Jacopo Bassano and his workshop acquired by Charles I, a testament to his popularity in seventeenth-century England.3 The painting was valued at £35 in 1649 for the Commonwealth sale, less than the £50 put on Bassano’s Journey of Jacob (no. 73), suggesting that his pastoral paintings were especially sought after.4

Many alterations to the design are visible through infra-red and x-ray examination. Joseph’s head was first painted to the right and then shifted to the left; his right foot continued under his cloak on the right; the dog was lower and smaller; the kneeling shepherd’s profile altered. There is another hand to the right of the Virgin’s, visible with both infra-red reflectography and x-radiography, which seems to be a version of the Virgin’s left hand in a praying position. There is a residue of crimson in this area, which could be her original sleeve (although not quite in the right position). This pose recalls that held by the Virgin Mary in Bassano’s earlier Adoration of the Shepherds, dated c. 1533, formerly in the collection of L.C. Wallach.1 Just to the right of the goat a man’s head, the lines on his brow already delineated, is clearly visible both in the paint and with infra-red (fig. 100), but less so in the x-radiography. There are two curved lines above his head, possibly an alternative position for the horns of the goat, or a hat which the figure was reaching up to remove. A second kneeling shepherd is included in the Wallach version.
and the almost contemporary Adoration of the Shepherds (Accademia, Venice); a shepherd bowing down removing his hat is in a similar place in the later composition of The Adoration of the Shepherds of c.1562 (Palazzo Corsini, Rome).

Scholars have generally agreed to date this painting c.1546, but have differed over its relationship to two similar but more mannered paintings by Bassano of the same date: The Adoration of the Shepherds (Accademia, Venice) of c.1545 or c.1547, and The Rest on the Flight into Egypt (Ambrosiana, Milan) of c.1545 or 1549–50.6

The present painting shows Bassano’s vision at its most distinctive, yet his inspiration can be traced from a variety of contemporary sources. In the early 1530s he was in Venice in the workshop of Bonifazio de’ Pitati; the meandering landscape seen from a high viewpoint is reminiscent of Bonifazio’s work, although the more frieze-like arrangement of figures is closer to Titian. Bassano is here inspired by a painting by Titian of the same subject known in two versions, one of which, now in the Picture Gallery at Christ Church, Oxford, belonged to Charles I, though it left the Royal Collection with the Commonwealth Sale.7 Bassano knew the painting through a woodcut, The Adoration of the Shepherds of 1535–40 (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; fig. 99), attributed to Giovanni Britto.8 Bassano borrowed many elements from the print: the Virgin Mary holding up the cloth to reveal the naked Christ Child; the dilapidated thatch of the stable; the column; the procession of shepherds (the last looking back over his shoulder and out of the picture) and the exact pose and clothes of the shepherd removing his hat (with his left hand, because of the reversal of the print). The detail of the architecture behind the goat and the inclusion of bagpipes derive from Dürer’s woodcut of the Adoration of the Shepherds, from the Small Passion of 1509–11, and the buildings and arch on the left from Dürer’s woodcut of the Holy Family in Egypt of 1502.9 The kneeling shepherd is based on a similar figure in Pordenone’s fresco of the Adoration of the Magi (Cappella Malchiostro, Duomo, Treviso) of 1520.10

In spite of these many influences, this painting shows a direct naturalism peculiar to Bassano in the animals, the maternal relationship between mother and child, the town caught in sunlight in the background, and the strikingly realistic face of the shepherd far right.

1 The same view appears in The Trinity (Parish Church, Angarano), The Good Samaritan (Royal Collection) and The Rest on the Flight into Egypt (Ambrosiana, Milan) of the second half of the 1540s.
2 Chastel 1975, pp. 146–9; Rearick in Bassano del Grappa 1992, p. 73.
5 Christie’s, London, Old Master Pictures, Friday 18 April 1997, lot 158.
6 Bassano del Grappa 1992, no. 16; London 1983b, no. 3. John Shearman summarises the various opinions on the date of the painting in the 1540s.
10 Furlan 1988, pp. 92–7, no. 2.3.
Jayko's habit of experimentation, changing styles to suit commissions, makes this work hard to date.¹ The painting has Mannerist qualities typical of his early work and learned from Parmigianino and Schiavone – long, sinuous figures arranged in a decorative, stylised fashion. It also has a naturalism of light and setting, which Jacopo rediscovered later in his career through the study of Titian’s pastorals, probably known to him through engravings and woodcuts.² A date of c.1561 can be suggested by comparison with St John the Baptist in the Wilderness, securely dated 1558 (Museo Civico, Bassano); Sts Justin, Sebastian, Anthony Abbot and Roch of c.1560 (Santa Giustina, Enego); The Crucifixion of c.1562–3 (Museo Civico, Treviso) and the Adoration of Shepherds of c.1562 (Palazzo Corsini, Rome).³ This is an early example of the pastoral landscape, one of Jacopo’s specialities and particularly admired by his contemporaries. In his brief appreciation of Jacopo Bassano, Vasari mentions his depiction of ‘animals of all sorts’. A larger version by Jacopo of this subject with a more spacious twilight landscape (1570s; Palazzo Ducale, Venice) was eloquently described by Carlo Ridolfi, who remarked that the artist made such Old Testament pastorals for his own pleasure, only occasionally selling them to dealers.⁴ This was also the type of work by Jacopo Bassano that appealed in England: this painting was valued at £50 in 1649 for the Commonwealth sale, compared with his Adoration of the Shepherds (no. 72) at just £35.⁵

¹ Heritage Auction Galleries, Dallas, 9 November 2006, lot 24027 (bought in); previously Charles John Lyttelton, 10th Viscount Cobham, Hagley Hall; Sotheby’s, London, 11 July 1973, lot 26; Christie’s, London, 10 April 1981, lot 61; Sotheby’s, London, 6 December 1989, lot 22; Richard L. Feigen, New York, by 1995; Sotheby’s, New York, 26 January 2006, no. 70. A collaboration with Jacopo has also been proposed. See Rearick and Romani in Bassano del Grappa 1992, pp. 112, 340; Rearick 1996, II, p. 45, fig. 764.

² Most scholars have dated the painting to the early 1560s; see Shearman 1983 and Romani in Bassano del Grappa 1992 for a summary of previous opinions.
The story comes from Ovid’s Metamorphoses (XI, 146–93): Pan boasts that his reed pipes make better music than Apollo’s lyre. Tmolus, the local mountain god, judges the contest and pronounces Apollo the winner. Midas, King of Phrygia, is on the mountain as a votary of Pan and disputes the verdict. As punishment Apollo gives him ass’s ears. Apollo’s instrument is shown as a lira da braccio (a seven-stringed precursor of the modern violin) rather than the ancient lyre (a type of hand-held harp). Tmolus turns to Minerva (with Medusa-head breastplate), seated on the extreme right, and points to Apollo as the victor. But Pan is still listening, resting his arm on his instrument, the pipes, and Midas remains enraptured by the pipes, and Midas remains unravelling.

The 1540s marks the assimilation of Mannerism in Venetian painting, a process to which Schiavone contributed. His most important source of inspiration was Parmigianino (see nos. 36–7 and 42), whose Mannerist elegance can be seen here, particularly in the figure types of Apollo and Minerva. The contorted pose of Midas seems to have been inspired by Michelangelo, probably transmitted to him by the Tuscan Mannerists Giorgio Vasari and Francesco Salviati (see nos. 8–9), both of whom worked in Venice in the 1530s. Richardson dated the painting c.1548–50, at a point when Schiavone’s innovative Mannerist style was tempered with more balanced and stable compositions. The figures are set in a rich Venetian landscape which looks forward to the artist’s own interpretation (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) dated to the early 1550s, of Titian’s Virgin and Child with the Infant St John and Female Saint or Donor of c.1532 (National Gallery, London; fig. 91). Although Titian derived the composition of his famously savage Painting of Marsyas of 1570–76 (Palace of Archbishop of Zamek a Zahrady, Kromeritz) from a Giulio Romano design, he must also have remembered elements of this painting: the pensive and abstracted attitudes of Apollo and Midas, and the radically free impressionistic brushwork used to heighten the dramatic mood of the story.

1 Shearman (1983, p. 227) argues that this is a Reyst picture in spite of complications in the provenance, see also Ridolfi 1914–24 edn, i, pp. 251, 257; Mahon 1949–50, p. 303, note 9; Mahon 1949–50, p. 13, no. 6; Logan (A.M.) 1979, pp. 145–6.
2 Winternitz 1967, pp. 156–65. The story is told in Ovid’s Fasti, 6, 703–8; Hyginus Fabulas, clxv, as well as his Metamorphoses (xi, xx). Also Ovidio metamorphoseis Vulgare, Venice 1497 and 1501 (xx). Winternitz 1967, pp. 152–5.
3 Shearman (1983) 1980 for the most comprehensive account of Schiavone; Shearman 1983, pp. 227–8; Fröhlich-Bum 1913, pp. 185–92.
4 Titian was ‘istupito’ at his technique; Aretino felt it lacked finish; Paolo Pino saw it as a ‘thing worthy of infamy’; see Richardson (F.L.) 1980, pp. 8–10.
5 The painting was conserved in 1997–8 when an overpainted sky was removed. The different sky in the Simon Griebelin engraving suggests a reworking before 1712. A glaze may have been lost in the flesh tones, making transitions more abrupt. The dark blue of the sky is possibly an azurite or another copper colour darkened with age. The trunks of the trees were painted over the ground with a brown glaze which has become more transparent, allowing the ground to show through. The composition was not radically changed but many pentiments and some planning lines are visible in the paint and can be seen in x-rays since Schiavone worked directly on the canvas.
6 These figures can be compared to Parmigianino drawings: Apollo and Marsyas (Morgan Library, New York) and Minerva (Louvre); see Popham 1971, nos. 319, 390–95. The figures on the right of the painting recall The Martyrdom of Sts Peter and Paul by Antonio da Trento, a chiaroscuro woodcut after a design of Parmigianino, Bartsch xxi, 79.28; see also Popham 1971, i, p. 12, figs. 19, 21.
7 Compare the figures of Sadocch and Jeremiah from the Sistine Chapel ceiling and Salviati’s Apollo and Marsyas, part of a ceiling in the Palazzo Grimani, Venice, dated 1540; see Richardson (F.L.) 1980, p. 164.
8 Rossi and Pallucchini feel that Richardson overstates the classical phase of Schiavone’s work and Pallucchini dates the painting to the mid-1550s. Rossi 1980a, pp. 78–95, p. 85; Pallucchini 1981, p. 25.
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Jacopo Robusti, called Il Tintoretto ‘the little dyer’ because of his father’s profession, became the most successful artist working in Venice. According to Ridolfi he was briefly in Titian’s studio before being expelled, supposedly out of jealousy. Tintoretto’s early work shows elements of the narrative style of Bonifazio de Pitati, the free handling and elegant forms of Parmigianino and Schiavone, and the dynamism of Pordenone. The Royal Collection Esther has recently been dated to c.1546–7, just as Tintoretto’s career was about to take off with his first major commission, St Mark Rescuing the Slave (Accademia, Venice) of 1547–8.1

The story is told in the Book of Esther in the Hebrew Bible, to which additions were made when it was translated into Greek.2 King Ahasuerus, or Xerxes I, ruled the Persian Empire when the Jews were captive (485–464 BC). Esther, his second wife, conceals her Jewish identity from him and learns that Haman, the King’s chief minister, is plotting to have all Jews in the Empire massacred. Encouraged by her cousin Mordecai, Esther decides to intercede with the King on behalf of her people. She fasts, puts on royal robes and approaches the King, an act full of danger since it was forbidden, on pain of death, for anyone to enter the inner court without a royal summons. In the Greek addition Esther faints when she sees his face full of anger; then ‘God changed the spirit of the king to gentleness, and in alarm he sprang from his throne and took her in his arms until she came to herself’. Eventually Ahasuerus grants her request to spare the Jews and Haman is hung on the gallows he had prepared for Mordecai.

Ahasuerus is described as ‘clothed in the full array of his majesty, all covered with gold and precious stones’; in the painting his golden robe originally had more orpiment – a bright orange-yellow pigment. Esther enters with two maids, ‘leaning daintily on one, while the other followed carrying her train’; she is ‘radiant with perfect beauty, but her heart was frozen in fear’.3 Tintoretto was one of the first artists to show her fainting, a motif that linked her to that of the Virgin collapsing at the foot of the Cross.4

There is another version of the painting, on the same scale, in the Escorial, which is generally accepted as a workshop replica (see fig. 101):5 in that painting two extra figures appear to the right and a kneeling boy in armour holds a banner behind the King. The same figure appears holding back a curtain in an engraving by Simon Gribelin after the Royal Collection painting made in 1712 (fig. 102).6

In the present painting the boy is gone and two unfinished figures occupy the same position: a twisting man, with a long scarf about his neck, and a shadowy, turbaned figure. It seems that these two figures were part of Tintoretto’s first idea for the composition: the twisting figure could be Haman reacting to the events behind the King, his long scarf knotted about his neck alluding to his future hanging, and the turbaned figure is his companion.7 The artist must then have changed his mind, left these figures half-finished, and painted a boy in armour over them. Possibly at this point Haman was painted in similar costume, and his turbaned companion, with soldiers and banners, in the centre background. At some date after 1712, probably in the nineteenth century, an unknown restorer decided to remove the boy in armour (along with the curtain and a portion of the left background), presumably in order to retrieve the two figures.8 Unfortunately the unfinished turbaned figure was damaged in the process, so presumably the same restorer replaced the boy in armour (with the curtain, surrounding background and the yellow highlights of Ahasuerus’s folds of drapery).9 At this stage the boy was at once original (that is, reflecting Tintoretto’s final intention for the painting) and entirely repainted. He can be seen, clearly of inferior quality compared with the original areas, in reproductions made before 1950.10

When Isepp cleaned the painting in 1950 he removed the boy and reconstructed the two figures below (the ‘twisting’ and the ‘turbaned’).11 This solution was also adopted...
during the 1991 conservation. The consequence is that Haman appears twice in the same painting.

In his Dialogo di Pittura published in 1548, a few years after this painting was completed, Paolo Pino claimed that Tintoretto had set out to combine the drawing of Michelangelo and the colour of Titian; Ridolfi later claimed that Tintoretto had this motto written on his studio wall. A series of drawings of this period show Tintoretto studying Michelangelo’s sculpture and that of his Venetian contemporaries (by this time heavily influenced by Michelangelo). Tintoretto does not exactly quote from Michelangelo here, as he does in St Mark Rescuing the Slave (1547–8; Accademia, Venice), but his confidently modelled, twisting and foreshortened figures clearly recall his work. We can also here detect the influence of a Florentine sculptor working in Venice, Jacopo Sansovino (1486–1570), whose turning pose of Mercury from the Loggetta, completed by 1546 (and studied by Tintoretto), can be related to the uncovered figure of Haman. In addition, the composition, with its crucial break between the King and Esther and the clearly defined space in which the events take place, is indebted to the narrative balance of Raphael’s work, particularly such models as his cartoon for The Sacrifice at Lystra (Victoria and Albert Museum).

As in Tintoretto’s St Mark Rescuing the Slave, some areas, like the turbans of the men on the right and centre, are wrought to a high level of finish, while other areas, like the foot of a figure behind the man in fur on the right, are left remarkably free and unresolved. Both there and in Esther before Ahasuerus intense colours – blue, gold, white and crimson – create an impression of exotic splendour, while strong light heightens the drama. In the present work the light source is in the top left foreground, casting such deep shadows that it is impossible to read the expression of Ahasuerus, the principal character. These effects of light and colour are perhaps typically Venetian, but Esther before Ahasuerus and St Mark Rescuing the Slave together mark a moment in Tintoretto’s career when his central Italian sources – Michelangelo, Raphael and Jacopo Sansovino – give a controlled energy to his figures which conveys a power and drama that is unprecedented in Venetian painting.

1 Shearman 1983, no. 255; Pallucchini and Rossi 1974–82, i, p. 129, no. 129, pp. 156–7; ii, fig. 169.
2 Jerome removed the Greek additions when he wrote the Latin Vulgate Bible in the fourth century AD. They were rejected as apocryphal in Protestant bibles, but declared canonical at the Council of Trent in 1546.
3 Additions to the Book of Esther, chapter 15.
5 Pallucchini and Rossi 1974–82, i, pp. 156–7, no. 130. It is wider, with two extra figures on the right. Cusping on this edge of no. 75 suggests that the prime version has not been cut.
7 Tintoretto uses exotic scarves like this in his Mazzio Scuola in front of Perseus (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and Crucifixion (Museo Civico, Padua), Pallucchini and Rossi 1974–82, nos. 90 and 97.
8 During the most recent conservation, carried out in 1991 by Rupert Featherstone, the vestiges of the original boy, which had apparently been removed by scraping with a knife, were observed and recorded.
9 The painting was restored by William III’s Surveyor, Parry Walton, before 1712. It is possible the drastic cleaning of this area took place before the 1712 print, but the detailed folds visible on the figure of Ahasuerus, which are no longer present, would suggest that the engraver saw the painting before the removal of the paint in that area.
10 Tietze 1948, fig. 10.
11 As reproduced in several publications between 1950 and 1991, including Pallucchini and Rossi 1974–82. The anxiety and caution over the decision to remove the repainted boy in armour in 1950 is recorded in correspondence in the file on the painting.
13 Boucher 1991, i, pp. 73–88, ii, no. 27, pp. 334–5; for Tintoretto’s drawings after this type of Sansovino figure see Tietze and Tietze-Conrat 1944, no. 1792.
TINTORETTO (JACOPO ROBUSTI)
Venice 1518–1594

76. The Muses c.1578

Oil on canvas
206.7 x 309.8 cm
Signed lower left: IACOMO / TENTORETO / IN. VENETIA
RCIN 405476

PROVENANCE
Recorded in the Mantuan inventory, 1627; acquired by Charles I; valued at £80 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to Widmore, 28 May 1650; recovered at the Restoration.

REFERENCES
Shearman 1983, no. 258; Pallucchini and Rossi 1974–82, no. 381.

Both Tintoretto paintings included here (see also no. 75) are of a similar size and, by 1627, were hanging together in the same passage in the Palazzo Ducale, Mantua. Although there is no record of the commissions, we know that Guglielmo Gonzaga, the 3rd Duke of Mantua, purchased other paintings direct from Tintoretto and visited the artist in Venice. The subject of the Muses is clearly appropriate for a court with a strong tradition of music and for a Duke with a personal interest in liturgical music. The painting is generally dated to the period when Tintoretto was producing a large number of paintings for the Scuola Grande di San Rocco and for the Doge’s Palace, as well as other private commissions. The word IN in the inscription has been thought to be an abbreviation of ‘invenit’ (meaning ‘invented’ by the artist, as opposed to the more usually ‘fecit’, ‘made’). This may imply that Tintoretto designed but did not execute all the painting himself as has been argued for the inscription on the Raising of Lazarus (St Catherine’s Church, Lübeck). The range of musical instruments normally associated with the Muses is here reduced to the harpsichord, bass viol, lute and lira da braccio, all expertly depicted by Tintoretto, who was himself an accomplished musician. The harpsichord can be compared to contemporary instruments made by Giovanni Baffo in Venice, but its long end, which is clear in the Indianapolis copy, is omitted. The near Muse on the right tunes and plays her lira da braccio at the same time: Tintoretto’s priority would seem to have been the dynamic of the turning figure rather than the accuracy in recording a performance.

The large, strongly modelled figures, boldly executed with sweeping strokes, strongly lit from the right, and freed from a landscape setting, weave a coherent design of dynamic diagonal lines across the picture plane and into the picture space. The execution and composition has been likened to the four large Allegories de i dei de gli antichi, published in Venice in 1556 and enlarged and reprinted in subsequent years. This source does not distinguish the garlands of flowers, laurel and palm leaves.

The large, strongly modelled figures, boldly executed with sweeping strokes, strongly lit from the right, and freed from a landscape setting, weave a coherent design of dynamic diagonal lines across the picture plane and into the picture space. The execution and composition has been likened to the four large Allegories...
of 1577–8 painted for an ante-room in the Palazzo Ducale, the Atrio Quadrato, for which Tintoretto was paid in 1577–8.9

Borghini records that even in his sixties, Tintoretto continued to collect and study models of famous statues, such as those by Giambologna (1529–1608), and never tired of copying them.10 The effect of such studies has been traced in paintings dating from the 1570s, including *The Muses*. The pose of the back view of the Muse on the right has been related to the so-called *Grotticella Venus* of c. 1570 (Boboli Grotto, Palazzo Pitti, Florence), but is closer to the smaller bronzes such as *Venus Drying Herself* of c. 1565 or *Astrology* of c. 1575 (both Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna).11 The pose is never exact, and the similarity lies in Tintoretto’s interest in Giambologna’s type of slender, elegant women in *contrapposto* poses. It has been suggested that the Muse flying in from the left derives from a Giambologna model of Lichas from *Hercules and Lichas* (one version now in the Art Institute of Chicago).12 According to Ridolfi, Tintoretto made models out of wax or clay, dressed them in cloth, studied the folds of the cloth on the limbs, and placed them in wood and cardboard constructions resembling miniature houses with small lamps alongside to introduce the effects of light and shade. Models were hung from roof beams so that they could be studied when seen from below.13 Such procedures enabled Tintoretto to create these powerfully articulated, flying nudes with such extraordinary freedom.

---

1 'Nel passetto per andar nelli camarini della Sala dei Specchi’, Luzio 1913, p. 109, no. 281; Morselli 2000, p. 292, no. 945.
2 For the series of eight battle paintings commissioned by the Duke in 1574 see Syrè in Munich 2000, pp. 13–27. Ridolfi (1914–24 edn, ii, no. 357; Bercken 1942, p. 111; Pallucchini 1969, p. 37) The inscription, including the abbreviation sign over ‘in’ appears to be original.
3 The inscription on the Lübeck painting reads *IACOMO TINTORETTO VENETIIS F.*, Pallucchini and Rossi 1974–82, i, nos. 382 and 146. Garas 1967, pp. 38–46. The Indianapolis painting measures 55.2 × 93.5 cm, the Rijksmuseum fragment (2302 e 6) 113 × 84 cm. See also Hadeln 1922, pp. 96–7 and Bercken 1942, p. 103, no. 5.
4 Many of the changes are visible to the naked eye, for example the leg of the reclining figure in centre foreground and in the sky to the lower left of the sun. Further changes are revealed by infra-red reflectography, in particular the head and torso of another figure sweeping in towards Apollo, just to the right of the harpsichord player. The original canvas is in two sections with a seam running horizontally through the neck of the lute at the left and the upper part of the head of the reclining figure to the right. There are narrow additions on all sides.
6 Cartari 1556, fols. xv verso to xvi recto.
7 Weddigen (E.) 1984, p. 105.
PAOLO VERONESE (PAOLO CALIARI) AND WORKSHOP
Verona 1528–Venice 1588

The Mystic Marriage of St Catherine of Alexandria c.1562–9

Oil on canvas
148.0 × 199.5 cm
RCIN 4072116

PROVENANCE
Sent from Venice to Amsterdam by Jan Reynst; acquired from the collection of his brother Gerard Reynst by the States of Holland and West Friesland and presented to Charles II, November 1660; placed in the Square Table Room at Whitehall (Charles II inventory, c.1666–7, Whitehall)
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The son of a stonemason, Paolo was born and trained in Verona, and later adopted the name Caliari. In 1551 he painted an altarpiece for the church of San Francesco della Vigna in Venice; two years later he settled in the city and, with Titian and Tintoretto, dominated Venetian patronage. Veronese’s early work betrays the influence of Giulio Romano, Parmigianino and other Mannerists, but in Venice he began to emulate Venetian artists, particularly Titian’s technique to create brilliant effects of light, rich colour, and opulent materials. He was assisted by a family workshop including his brother Benedetto, and his sons Gabriele and Carletto.

Before her martyrdom, Catherine of Alexandria was mystically married to Christ by the Virgin Mary, a ceremony seen as an allegory of the pious soul’s spiritual betrothal to God. Here she is richly dressed and crowned (the Golden Legend records that she was of royal birth) and kneels on part of the broken wheel on which she was to have been executed. With one hand the Christ Child takes the ring from the young John the Baptist, unique in Veronese’s depictions of this subject, and with his other he takes Catherine’s hand to receive it.

The early historian of Venetian art Carlo Ridolfi (1594–1658) was especially enthusiastic about this painting. When he described it as one of the most admired works by the artist the painting had already been sent from Venice to Jan Reynst’s house in Amsterdam. But by the nineteenth century the attribution was doubted. Although some recent critics have accepted it as by Veronese, the prevailing opinion is that his brother Benedetto Caliari (1538–98) contributed to its execution: the compact, solid figures and heavier modelling of folds are more typical of his style.

This painting dates from a period when Veronese became more aware of the heritage of classical antiquity and the High Renaissance. In 1560 he visited Rome (with Girolamo Grimani, Procurator of San Marco), where he must have studied Raphael, Michelangelo and antique art. In 1561 he provided fresco decoration for the Villa Maser, built for Daniele Barbaro, the humanist and translator of Vitruvius, and designed by Andrea Palladio, the most classically erudite architect of the period. This painting also shows the impact of these classical influences. There is a grandeur in this scene, the figures are clearly organised on an imposing stage, and given dignity by our low viewpoint. Other commissions of this period show Veronese using figures and architecture in a similar way, for example the Feast in the House of Simon (c.1566; Galleria Sabauda, Turin). The landscape, showing a city like Verona by a river framed by a ruined building, has been compared with similar landscapes by the artist in the Villa Barbaro at Maser (where Veronese’s brother Benedetto certainly contributed substantially to the work).

The ruined building recalls the Septizonium that also appears in the Stanza del Tribunale d’Amore in the Villa Barbaro. This was the three-storey ornamental façade and nymphaeum in Rome dedicated to Septimus Severus in AD 203, which was fortified in about AD 1000, but gradually deteriorated until it was demolished in 1588–9. Despite his recent Roman visit, Veronese seems to have copied the antique buildings at Maser both from the famous set of prints made by Hieronymus Cock and copies of his prints by Battista Pittoni. The classical building in this painting is not an exact quotation from Cock and must derive from another source, such as a Pittoni etching (Uffizi) which almost exactly replicates the building in reverse (fig. 104). A similar ruined building derived from a Cock print fills the background of Veronese’s Supper at Emmaus (Louvre), usually dated to the same period.

There is an unusually intimate relationship between the figures in this painting, an idea which Veronese explored in a series of studies covering a single sheet dated c.1568–9, now in the Boymans-Van Beuningen Museum, Rotterdam. Other paintings by Veronese and his workshop have been related to these pen and ink ideas: his Holy Family with Sts Barbara (or St Catherine) and John the Baptist of c.1562–5 (Uffizi) and Mystic Marriage of St Catherine (versions in Musée des Beaux-Arts, Brussels;
the Timken Art Gallery, San Diego; and the Musée Fabre, Montpelier). Shearman suggested that Veronese had developed the unusual idea of St John holding up the ring from a engraving by Giorgio Ghisi, dated to the mid-1550s, which was based on a composition by Francesco Primaticcio. Veronese may have been inspired by the print, but he and his workshop must have been producing variations on this theme in the 1560s. The figure of John in a similar tunic intervening in the group is closest to his counterpart in the San Diego painting, produced by Veronese's workshop and recorded in an engraving, while the landscape setting has the splendour of the lost world of antiquity also captured in the pastoral landscapes of the Villa Maser.

1 Ridolfi 1914–24, edn, 1, p. 340.
2 Redgrave sheet 5 July 1879, 'after Veronese'.
3 Shearman 1983, pp. 289–91, no. 317; Pignatti 1976, 1, no. A125, pp. 185–6, believes that Benedetto participated in the execution; Piovene and Marini (1968, p. 105) and Ballarin (1968, p. 42) accepted the work as entirely autograph.
5 Crosato Larcher (1962, pp. 56–61; 1969, pp. 115–30; 1990, p. 257) has researched the career of Veronese's brother, Benedetto.
6 Cock's Praecipua Aliquot Romanae Antiquitatis Ruinam cum vivis prospectibus ad veri imitati
7 Oberhuber (1968, p. 218, note 37) mentions that the ruin in the Mystic Marriage is close to the Pittoni print in the Uffizi (no. 2642). The author is grateful to Marzia Faietti and Marino Marini for confirming this link. Infra-red reflectography reveals that originally a different building was planned for the left background of the Royal Collection painting. The canvas has additions by the workshop or later at the top, bottom and left.
8 Oberhuber 1968, p. 218; Pignatti 1976, no. 91; Rearick 1988, no. 43, pp. 90–92; Cocke 1984, no. 56, pp. 140–41.
9 Pignatti 1976, nos. 128, 129, A38, A120.
10 Bartsch xv, no. 390.12; Boorsch and Lewis in New York 1985b, no. 17.
78. The Expulsion of the Vices of the Church c. 1581–4

Oil on canvas
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Acquired by Charles I from Nathaniel Garrett; valued at £10 by the Trustees for sale and sold to Stone and others, October 1651; declared by John Stone to the House of Lords Committee in May 1666; recorded in Charles II's inventory, c.1666–7, Whitehall.
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Jacopo Palma il Giovane, usually called Palma Giovane (the Younger), was the great-nephew of Jacopo Palma or Palma Vecchio (the Elder). He probably first trained with his father, Antonio Palma. He was supported by Guidobaldo II della Rovere, Duke of Urbino, from 1567 and sent to Rome where he must have studied the art of the antique, Michelangelo and Raphael and contemporary Mannerists such as Taddeo and Federico Zuccaro (see no. 10). On his return to Venice he established a prolific and successful workshop, becoming the leading painter in the city after the death of Tintoretto in 1594.

Palma's central Italian influences are particularly evident in his early work, of which this is an example: the clearly defined figure of the angel with outstretched arms and sword in hand can be linked to Michelangelo's Expulsion of Adam and Eve on the Sistine Chapel ceiling: the raised hand of the nude on the left is similar to that of Adam. The clarity of the design and the way in which the two expelled figures in Palma's painting plunge rhythmically in opposite directions recalls Michelangelo's Conversion of St Paul (Cappella Paolina, Vatican), as well as later interpretations of it such as the fresco of the same subject by Taddeo Zuccaro (Cappella Frangipane, San Marcello al Corso, Rome), commissioned in 1557 and completed by Federico. More important were Palma's great Venetian predecessors and he combines traits from each of them. He completed Titian's Pietà (Accademia, Venice), left unfinished at his death, and it was from Titian that he derived his technique and understanding of light. The freely turning figures are from Tintoretto, who was the most crucial influence on Palma's work. The opulence of Veronese can be traced in the luxurious robes, particularly those of the angel, and the play of light on her flesh. Like the Bassano family, Palma was interested in naturalism; his portraits in particular are direct and scrupulous in the recording of specific features. It is not surprising, in view of these influences, that this painting has at various times been attributed to Tintoretto and Veronese, as well as to Palma Giovane.

An x-radiograph (fig. 105) reveals that the painting is now made up of several pieces of canvas. The earliest addition is a square, in a finer weave of canvas and with a different ground butt-joined at the bottom right-hand corner. Tears visible above this join suggest that the original canvas may have become damaged and an area removed for this reason, but it is more likely that it was adapted to incorporate a doorway where it was originally hung. If so, the painting was probably moved and the corner restored early in its life as the addition matches the original areas so well that it could have been by someone in Palma's studio. The original location for the painting also seems to have been arched, like a lunette (the curve of the angel's pose just fitted inside the original canvas border); the present rectangular shape has been achieved by adding sections with a rougher canvas weave to the top corners. It is interesting that Charles I acquired the painting without a frame, which suggests it was taken from an architectural setting where it had not needed one. The power of the tight design was dissipated when the canvas was extended to an oblong shape. Van der Doort's measurements in his inventory 1637–9, record a slightly smaller size than the current one, which proves that the thin strips of approximately 2.5 cm in width on all the edges were added after it had arrived in the Royal Collection. The sky, which incorporates these strips, may have been repainted at the same time, possibly in the eighteenth century. Infra-red reflectography reveals that Palma drew the areas of flesh and the faces in thin, sweeping strokes of underdrawing, similar to the fluid modelling of muscles in his drawings.

The painting has been dated to early in Palma's career, when he had completed major commissions for the Doge's Palace and was gaining favour with ecclesiastical patrons because of his ability to represent Counter-Reformation doctrine in a direct and understandable form. The original purpose of The Expulsion is not known and the allegory is difficult to interpret with certainty, although it clearly depicts the just chastisement of sin. The portraits cannot be identified and it is unlikely that the head of the central figure is a self-portrait, as is sometimes suggested, since it does not resemble Palma's most famous self-portrait of c.1590 (Brera). The subject was thought to represent the expulsion of Heresy...
in the nineteenth century; the 1946 Royal
Academy exhibition catalogue interpreted it as
the expulsion of the Protestants from Venice.7
Recently it has been proposed that the three men
were magistrates (in which case the painting
came from a courtroom), or that they were
the ‘tre savio all’eresia’, the three noblemen
appointed by the Doge to assist the Church
authorities in trials against heretics.8 The best
evidence as to its subject is provided by Van
der Doort’s inventory of 1637–9 (only a decade
after Palma’s death), which describes the allegory
as Virtue ‘separating the Vices’ and specifically
mentions ‘Usury and Simony’.9 The fleeing
figure with his back to us holds papers, which
could suggest Simony (the buying and selling
of ecclesiastical privileges); the old man
turning to look at the angel as he flees holds
a money-bag, which could suggest Usury
(lending money at interest). The painting may
have been painted for one of the Venetian
confraternities (scuole), which were important
patrons of Palma at this time, in which case
these men were lay and clerical members of
such a confraternity, working together to rid
the church of these abuses.10
In 1773 Sir Joshua Reynolds and Dr James
Beattie, Professor of Moral Philosophy at
Marischal College, Aberdeen, visited the
Queen’s House (later Buckingham Palace)
to see the Raphael cartoons and must have
seen this painting as well. Reynolds used the
composition when he painted his portrait of
Dr James Beattie in The Triumph of Truth
(1733; University of Aberdeen), which shows an
angel holding the scales of justice and chasing
off a figure of Infidelity (given the features
of Voltaire).11

1 It was attributed to Palma in the seventeenth
century and to Tintoretto and Veronese in the
eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. All three
names appear on the Redgrave sheet of 1859.
Waagen (1854, ii, p. 358) returned the painting
to Palma Giovane in 1854; see Shearman 1983,
pp. 171–2; Mason Rinaldi 1984, no. 110.
2 The join cuts through the head of the cleric on the right
where the original canvas must have been trimmed.
3 Van der Doort (Millar 1960, p. 47) gives the size as
1 ft 2 in by 4 ft 4 in (97 × 132 cm).
4 Compare the charcoal sketch, Accademia Carrara
and Museo Fantoni 1964, no. 8.18.
5 See Shearman 1983, p. 171; Mason Rinaldi 1984,
no. 148.
6 London 1946, no. 190. The Redgrave sheet of 1859
was amended from ‘Three Ecclesiastics protected
by an Angel from the assault of vicious men’ to the
‘Expulsion of Heresy’.
7 Ivanoff and Zampetti 1980, p. 539; Mason Rinaldi
8 Van der Doort (Millar 1960, p. 47) described the
painting as: ‘Done by young Palmo Bought by ju M
of Nathaniell Garret Item the Pece pijnit opan de
lijight where Virtue with a Swoard is Seperating the
Vices [3oll]asser and simoni from the 3 Churchmen
painted uppon board without a frame Bought by
ju M.’
9 See, for example, Mason Rinaldi 1984, nos. 519–27
(the Oratorio dei Crociferi, 1583–92), 570–73 (the
Scuola Grande di San Giovanni Evangelista, 1581–q).
10 Mannings 2000, i, no. 138.
LODOVICO POZZOSERRATO (LODEWIJK TOEPUT)
Antwerp (or Mechelen) c.1550–Treviso c.1605

79. Pleasure Garden with a Maze c.1579–84

Oil on canvas
147.4 x 200.0 cm
RCIN 402610

Provenance
Probably the painting bought by Sir Dudley Carleton in Venice for Robert Carr, the Earl of Somerset, and arrived in London 1615; recorded in Charles II inventory c.1666–7, Whitehall (‘Mr Wright’s Lottery’)

References

The Flemish artist Lodewijk Toeput is thought to have been a pupil of Marten de Vos before travelling to Italy, probably in about 1575, where he presumably joined Tintoretto’s workshop. He is documented as an independent master in Venice in 1576. He was in Florence in the late 1570s and there is evidence that he visited Rome in about 1581 from a drawing, The interior of the Colosseum (Albertina, Vienna). By February 1582 he is documented in Treviso, where he Italianised his name to Pozzoserrato. His work is an interesting combination of Netherlandish and Venetian styles. He maintained good contacts with painters and engravers back in Antwerp such as Marten de Vos, Hans Vredeman de Vries and other northern masters in Venice, for example Lambert Sustris, who worked with Titian, and Pauwels Frank, called Paolo Fiammino, who also worked with Tintoretto. Other northern artists were based at Treviso when Toeput moved there. His interest in topography was encouraged by the draughtsman-engraver Joris Hoefnagel, with whom he collaborated to produce views for G. Braun and F. Hogenberg’s atlas Civitates orbis terrarum (Cologne, 1572–1618). Joris Hoefnagel’s 1578 engraving, for this publication, of the Piazzetta with the Doge’s Palace on fire, served as a basis for Toeput’s painting of the same subject now in the Museo Civico, Treviso (fig. 106).

Toeput’s earlier work, of which the current painting is an example, shows the impact of Tintoretto; he was influenced subsequently by Jacopo and Leandro Bassano, and by Veronese and his school. Toeput particularly learned from Veronese’s decorative schemes in fresco, such as that at the Villa Barbaro at Maser. His most memorable works are his imaginary pleasure gardens, often with pergolas and sculptures, which provide the setting for religious subjects such as Dives and Lazarus (Schloss Wilhelmshöhe, Kassel) and The Prodigal Son (Monte di Pietà, Treviso), as well as such gallant scenes of hunting, music and picnics as the Banquet in the Open Air (private collection, Treviso) and Outdoor Concert (Museo Civico Luigi Ballo, Treviso). Restoration has revealed that the picture is the work of at least two artists, one of whom may be Pozzoserrato. The thinly brushed style of the earlier painter is seen in the view of the Piazzetta and the landscape in the top centre, which is depicted in transparent shades of turquoise green and blue, the trees painted with a delicate feathery touch. His figures are simply but confidently modelled, as in the groups of larger figures at the bottom left and right. It is difficult to estimate at what date the second artist intervened, but probably after the first paint layer had begun to develop craquelure and some paint loss. This artist substantially reworked the composition, with a very distinctive and more decorative style of his own. His depiction of trees and foliage, seen principally on the left and right sides, is more stylised, with arabesque forms and a more opaque application of paint. He overpainted many of the existing figures, such as the drummer on the boat at the lower left, with incise highlights and cursive brushstrokes, and also seems to have added figures, like the group of the huntsmen at the upper right.

The restoration of the painting has complicated the question of attribution to Pozzoserrato. The bright green and blue tonality of the earlier artist is characteristic of Pozzoserrato, as are the high viewpoint and the abrupt recession; the view of Venice seems to rise up in the same way as the distant areas do in Pozzoserrato’s drawing of San Giovanni in Laterano (National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh). The compositions of the roundels of the Four Seasons, or Months of c.1584, two paintings of the group now in Providence, Rhode Island School of Design Museum of Art, have similar effects of recession in space using clearly receding diagonals, with tiny figures. The windswept foliage with feathery trees, typical of a Venetian training, can also be found in the drawing Landscape with St John on Patmos (Morgan Library, New York); the arched bridge with broad steps in the drawing Raven with a scorpion (Louvre) and the steps cut into the rock in the drawing Rocky landscape (art market, Berne). The view of the Piazzetta di San Marco is a naïve interpretation of that in his Fire in the Doge’s Palace, the boat revealed by the restoration similar to one in the foreground of this painting. However, in the present scene a building of large stone blocks on the left has taken the place of the Library and in front is an imaginary arched bridge, which makes this vignette more of a fantasy. The round building on the horizon in the distance is very close to a building in the drawing of David and Bathsheba (formerly private collection, Marburg).

This fascinating pleasure garden reflects a variety of visual and literary sources. There are comparable scenes in Flemish art: Lucas Valckenborch’s Spring (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) depicts similar aristocratic pleasures taking place in front of a highly organised vista beyond. Contemporary Italian literature abounds with recreational gardens, like the one with ‘beautiful hedges’, ‘thick pergolas of jasmine, roses myrtle and laurel’ and ‘several flowing streams, by the cool fishpond and the magnificent fountain’ described by Agostino Gallo in his treatise, the Dieci giornate della vera agricoltura e piazzere della villa di 1564. There were also real gardens designed in the period along these lines: those of the Villa di Priuli, described by Doni in 1566 and visited by Empress Maria, daughter of Charles V and widow of the Emperor Maximilian.

At the heart of the garden lies a maze or labyrinth (as it would then have been called). Classical sources such as Ovid and Plutarch describe the mythical Labyrinth (designed by Daedalus for King Minos of Crete to hide his Minotaur) as if it were a circular maze. It was regarded as a symbol of the underworld and therefore of hell in the Christian tradition and
also as a place of redemption. Boccaccio
describes a maze in his imaginary gardens,
and there are records of ‘dédales’ ('Daedaluses'
or labyrinths) in France in the fourteenth and
fifteenth centuries, but it is impossible to
determine whether they are made of clipped
hedge or bricks and mortar. An English poem
dated c.1450 describes the amusement and
frustration of a group of ladies getting lost in
a hedge-maze.9 These are places where people
could enjoy conversation and exercise and also
be diverted by the challenge of reaching the
centre. Toeput’s painting provides an impor-
tant visual record of a clipped-hedge garden
labyrinth.10 It is uni-cursal, involving only one
choice of path at the beginning, and is filled
with amorous couples. Rather than conveying
a moral significance, the scene seems to be one
of pleasure. Uncontrolled nature is evident in
the surrounding hills and trees, but in the centre,
where figures enjoy a banquet, it has been tamed
by man and is part of the civilisation of villa life.

The source for the design of the maze set in
a landscape was probably a northern print, such
as the Cretan Labyrinth by Hieronymous Cock
(Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich)
or those in the Civitates orbis terrarum or the
Hortorum viridariumque elegantes of 1583.11 The
use of print sources gives the scene a theatrical
unreality, which can be added to the fantastic
arched bridge and the strange circular building
in the distance, giving the sense of a stage set.
The figures gathered on the barge lower left
recall the teatri galleggianti of Venetian festivals.12

1 Joos de Momper, possibly Hans Rottenhammer
and Dirck de Vries; see Crosato Larcher 1988, p. 72.
For Pozzoserrato’s work see Menegazzi 1957.
3 The attribution to Pozzoserrato was first proposed
by Wegner (1961, p. 108); see also Shearman 1983,
no. 263, and Pallucchi and Rossi 1974–82, i,
no. 43.
4 The author is grateful to Renate Woudhuysen-Keller
and Alison Stock of the Hamilton Kerr Institute for
this information.
5 Washington 1986a, no. 112; Menegazzi 1957,
p. 206, 1961, p. 122 and 1988, p. 67; Pietrogiovanna
6 In the Charles II inventory the painting was
described as ‘Venetian pastime in the Island of
St George’, which, as Shearman points out, must
have been written by someone who knew Venice
well since the view of the Piazzetta is close to
that seen from San Giorgio Maggiore.
7 Crosato Larcher mentions Landscape with a Castle
(Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) in 1988, p. 72.
8 This occurred in 1581 when Toeput was staying at
nearby Treville; Crosato Larcher 1988, p. 71.
9 Reed Doob 1990, pp. 110–11; Lazzaro 1966, p. 57;
Kern 2000, pp. 228–9; Pearsall 1962.
10 An interesting earlier example is in Lucas Gassel’s
David and Bathsheba (Wadsworth Atheneum,
Hartford, and Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum,
Boston, two of several versions), which could allude
to David’s temptation away from the right path;
see Bord 1976, p. 108.
11 The latter by Vredeman de Vries, see Crosato
Larcher 1988, p. 73.
80. Portrait of Tiziano Aspetti c. 1592–3

Oil on canvas
88.0 × 67.2 cm
Signed top right: LEANDER BAS / SANVS. / .F.
RCIN 405988

PROVENANCE
Probably in the collection of Marco Mantova Benavides and his descendant Andrea Mantova Benavides, 1695; bought by George III, 1762, with the collection of Consul Smith (Italian List [278]).

REFERENCES

Leandro, Jacopo Bassano’s third son, trained and worked with his father in Bassano del Grappa until 1588, when he set up his own workshop in Venice. Although he painted religious and historical subjects, he became more famous as a portrait painter. After painting the portrait of Doge Marino Grimani (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden) in 1595 Leandro was named a Knight of St Mark, and on subsequent portraits sometimes added Eques to his signature.

The sitter here is almost certainly Tiziano Aspetti, one of the leading sculptors in Venice at the end of the sixteenth century. The likeness can be compared to the later bust made for his tomb in the Carmine, Pisa, by his pupil Felice Palma. 1 Aspetti probably trained in the family workshop in Padua and may have been the assistant of the slightly older Girolamo Campagna. In 1577 he entered the service of Giovanni Grimani, Patriarch of Aquileia, who had the most important collection of antique sculpture outside Rome. For sixteen years Aspetti had a workshop at the Grimani Palace in Venice and was responsible for restoring some of the marbles, offered to the Venetian Republic in 1589 and arranged in the Statuario Pubblico, Biblioteca Marciana, in 1596. 2 On 3 November 1590 Tiziano Aspetti and Girolamo Campagna each agreed to carve a colossal marble figure to flank the entrance to the Public Mint (Zecca), directly opposite the Doge’s Palace in Venice, as part of Vincenzo Scamozzi’s extension and modification of Sansovino’s buildings. 3 The statuette here is probably Aspetti’s wax model for this colossal statue of Hercules. The portrait was presumably painted to celebrate the completion of this prestigious public commission in c. 1592–3, a date consistent with the style of the painting. 4

The portrait has a directness typical of Leandro Bassano and betrays the influence of Jacopo Tintoretto’s earlier portraits, especially in the concentration of light on the face and hands. The way in which Aspetti presents his statuette to the viewer on an Oriental red carpet recalls the pose and setting of Veronese’s slightly earlier (c. 1587–8) portrait of a sculptor (now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York). Aspetti, as court artist to an erudite and eminent family, appears elegantly dressed, especially in comparison with Moroni’s Alessandro Vittoria of c. 1551 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), an image of the working sculptor with rolled-up sleeves. Aspetti might even be taken for a collector, handling a prized work, like Lotto’s Andrea Odoni (no. 66). The only difference between sculptors and collectors in images of this kind is that the former are usually shown with a single work (the one they are presenting to the viewer or to their patron), whereas the latter tend to be surrounded by the many riches of their collection. 5

1 Timofiewitsch 1972, pp. 32–3; Shearman 1983, pp. 35–7, no. 29; Vicenza 2003, pp. 208–209. The painting is likely to be the portrait, said to depict Girolamo Campagna, listed in the 1665 inventory of Marco Mantova Benavides. Consul Smith may have acquired the painting when this collection was dispersed at the death of Andrea Benavides in 1711. In Consul Smith’s list it is described as a portrait of “Domenico Campana Statuary”, a muddled version of two possible names: the sculptor Girolamo Campagna or the painter Domenico Campagnola; see Boucher 1980, pp. 159–64; Favorotto 1972, pp. 35–43, 122–4; Kryza-Gersch 1998, pp. 266–7.


3 The building is now the Libreria Marciana. In 1587–8 Aspetti collaborated with his former master, when he carved a small marble relief of Vulcan’s forge over the chimney in the Sala dell’Anticollegio in the Doge’s Palace while Campagna contributed the large supporting Atlantes.

4 The fact that there is no Eques in the signature also suggests a pre-1595 dating.

ATTRIBUTED TO GIROLAMO SAVOLDO
Brescia c.1480 – Venice 1548

81. The head of a man c. 1520–30

Black and white chalks on blue paper, much damaged
37.6 × 26.0 cm
Inscribed below: *Questa Testa è assai Bella et io non la posso Giudicare se non d’un Gran Mano / Della gran scola Fiorentina*

PROVENANCE
Presumably Royal Collection by c.1810 (though not identified in Inv. A)

REFERENCES
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 1112; Blunt 1971, no. 435; Brescia 1990, no. ii.1

No completely convincing attribution has been found for this large and impressive head study.¹ The inscription, apparently of the sixteenth century, shows that an early collector judged it to be Florentine, and there is something about the decorative drawing of the hair (so far as can be judged) that does not allow this opinion to be dismissed out of hand. But the use of blue paper was much more common in northern Italy, and Creighton Gilbert has claimed the drawing as the work of Girolamo Savoldo (see nos. 67–8).² Savoldo’s three decades based in Venice resulted in relatively few paintings (many of which are repetitions) and even fewer drawings, nearly all of which are of this type: black chalk heads on blue paper. Gilbert claimed that the present sheet was a self-portrait, based on the supposed facial resemblance to other presumed self-portraits: a prophet (who holds a scroll bearing Savoldo’s signature) in Vienna; San Liberale at the far right of the *Pala di San Nicolò* in Treviso; and the so-called ‘*Gaston de Foix*’ in the Louvre.³ While the identification of the Vienna painting as a self-portrait is very plausible, and the saint in the Treviso altarpiece does seem to depict the same person, there is a danger of identifying any similarly bearded, bushy-haired man in Savoldo’s oeuvre as a self-portrait. ‘*Gaston de Foix*’ has a different nose, short and fleshy rather than long and bony, and the subject of the Windsor drawing seems different again, with a stronger chin, broader lower face and less deep-sunk eyes than the Vienna figure.

The attribution to Savoldo has not been generally accepted, and is here followed only tentatively, for the fine combination of breadth of concept with tightness of detail is not characteristic of the artist.⁴ Lucco ascribed the drawing to Bernardino Licinio,⁵ but while the drawing is most probably by some Venetian artist around 1520–30, it is broader and more free than the rather flatly conceived heads of Licinio’s many painted portraits (see no. 71).

1 An inscription on the old mount apparently attributed the drawing to Paris Bordone, and Popham (in Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 1112) classed it as Milanese of c. 1530–40.
3 Gilbert 1986, pp. 426–34; these identifications, including that of the drawing as a self-portrait, were accepted unquestioningly by Gelfand 1995, p. 16.
4 Boschetto 1963, p. 228, agreed with the old inscription in giving the sheet to an anonymous Tuscan Mannerist. Frangi 1992, p. 44, also rejected the attribution to Savoldo, without offering an alternative.
5 Lucco 1990, p. 90.
82. The Annunciation c. 1537

The drawing is a study for Pordenone’s large altarpiece of the Annunciation (fig. 107) in the conventual church of Santa Maria degli Angeli on the Venetian island of Murano – his last major painting, and (like several other works of this period) produced in more or less direct competition with Titian. The Annunciation was said by Vasari to have been commissioned from Pordenone after Titian’s altarpiece of the same subject had been rejected by the sisters as being too expensive at 500 scudi.1 Titian sent the painting instead to Isabelle of Portugal, wife of the Emperor Charles V, who supposedly paid him 2,000 scudi, and a congratulatory letter to Titian from his friend Pietro Aretino of November 1537 provides an approximate date for the beginning of Pordenone’s work on the project. Titian’s painting is lost, but an idea of the composition is given by an engraving by Gian Giacomo Caraglio.2

The dedication of the church to Santa Maria degli Angeli explains the prominence of angels in the painting – not just the annunciatory Gabriel (his pose taken from Pordenone’s Annunciation of ten years earlier for the church of San Pietro Martire in Udine3), but also the archangel Michael with the scales for weighing human souls, and in the distant landscape the guardian angel Raphael with Tobias. In the drawing Raphael appears instead at upper centre, his arm around Tobias who clutches his fish. Both here and in Titian’s composition the Virgin is submissive, with hands held in prayer or folded across her breast, whereas in the altarpiece she holds her hands apart in surprise, and her bold twist seen in the drawing has been abandoned.

The group of God the Father and his flanking cherubim is here uncomfortably small, and drawn in a different manner from the rest of the sheet, with the black chalk repeatedly dampened to strengthen the tone and accentuate the outlines of the figures. It may be that Pordenone made a late decision to add the group – a reprise of several earlier compositions by the artist – when it became apparent that all the visual interest of the tall altarpiece would otherwise be concentrated in the lower half. Subsequent studies would have corrected the relative sizes of the figures in the composition; but by scaling the composition up to the huge dimensions of the altarpiece, in which the figures are life-size, Pordenone lost the dense luminosity of the drawing, and the stretched spaces between the figures were drained of emotional intensity.

A sheet in the Louvre, sketched on both sides with slight studies including an Annunciation and airborne angels, has been connected with the project, though there is no compelling case for this.4

---

1 Vasari 1906 edn, vii, p. 441.
2 Bartsch xvi, p. 67, no. 3.
3 Destroyed, but known through a later copy; Cohen (C.E.) 1996, no. 50.
Pomponio Amalteo
Motta di Livenza, Veneto 1505 – San Vito al Tagliamento, Veneto 1588

83. The Martyrdom of St Stephen c. 1535 – 40

Pen and ink with brown wash and white heightening, over black chalk, on blue paper, upper corners cut
35.6 x 23.2 cm
Inscribed at lower left: Del Bordonone, and at lower centre, effaced pencil: Del B…
Verso: a slight black chalk sketch

Provenance
Royal Collection by c. 1810 (Inv. A, p. 59, Titiano Paolo Veronese e Scuola Veneziana, "Pordenone")

References
Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 751; Pordenone 1980, p. 85; Furlan 2000, no. 27

Pomponio Amalteo was the pupil and assistant of Pordenone (no. 82) until at least 1532, when he begins to emerge in documents as an artist in his own right. He married Pordenone's daughter in 1534, and presumably maintained close contact until the older artist's death in 1539. Thereafter Amalteo's art ossified, and he showed little development over a long career of large-scale production for the provincial patrons of the Veneto and Friuli.

Naturally, at the start of his career his drawings were thoroughly indebted to the example of his master, and Popham tentatively followed the old attribution to Pordenone inscribed on this drawing, along with a stylistically identical Supper at Emmaus that he related to other Pordenonesque drawings, including a Judgement of Daniel in the Louvre (which the Tietzes had already attributed to Amalteo¹). Following the definition of Amalteo's graphic personality by Cohen in 1973, the sheet has been unanimously recognised as his.²

Amalteo's unadventurous artistic personality seems to have led him to produce relatively few exploratory sketches. More typical were carefully finished drawings such as this, almost certainly a modello for a lost and undocumented altarpiece, which fixed the composition for the benefit of his patron and workshop assistants. Like many artists working for provincial patrons (cf. no. 54), Amalteo frequently repeated his motifs: the horseman beating back the crowd, for instance, is also to be found in his drawing of the Continence of Scipio in the Louvre.³

Similarly, a dense cluster of airborne figures is a common feature of the paintings of both Pordenone (see no. 82) and Amalteo, and it is a sign of the derivative nature of the group that Christ looks and gestures inappropriately to the left, not down to the martyr. But the dominant influence on the composition is Giulio Romano's altarpiece of the subject in Santo Stefano, Genoa, with the saint thrust forward in pictorial space, flanked by his lapidators. Pordenone had worked in Genoa around 1532, painting frescoes on the façade of the Palazzo Doria, and it is possible that Amalteo had accompanied him for at least a part of his stay in the city. With its total immersion in Pordenone's style, the drawing may probably be dated to within a few years of that visit.

¹ Tietze and Tietze-Conrat 1944, no. 24.
Though Venetian by birth, Battista Franco spent much of his career in Rome (assiduously copying Michelangelo and the antique) and Florence, and did not return to Venice until the 1550s, where he continued to work in a central Italian style at odds with prevailing Venetian modes. His eclectic and sometimes chaotic paintings were less successful than his many drawings, prints, and designs for maiolica. Franco produced about a hundred prints, later in life experimenting with a combination of etching and engraving on unusually large plates.

The details of the Windsor drawing agree closely with the print, though there the waistband is reduced in width, a cloak is added, and the figure is tilted back a little. In the Metropolitan Museum is a comparable red-chalk study for the figure of Christ in the composition. That drawing is a nude study to which Franco would later add the loincloth and the usual facial features of Christ, including a beard; these amendments seem to confirm that Franco was not copying a painting but was devising the figures afresh, and he must be credited with the invention.

Scholars have been unanimous in dating the print to early in Franco’s final Venetian period, whether or not they have accepted the design as his. Van der Sman (2003) raised the possibility that Franco had conceived the composition as a painting and that he later decided to render it in a print. The figures are reversed in the print and their handedness does not help to resolve the matter – the two flagellators seen here are left-handed in the drawing, right-handed in the print; the other two nearest Christ are left-handed in the print, but this may simply have been a compositional device to maintain an open and inward direction to their poses and actions. Both studies are a little larger than the corresponding figures in the print, and there is no evidence of mechanical transfer (such as incised outlines) to or from these sheets. Nonetheless, the appropriateness of scale and conception of these figures for a typical late, large print by Franco would support the simpler contention, that the composition was intended from the outset to be engraved.

1 Bartsch xvi, p. 122, no. 10; Van der Sman 2003, no. iv.13.
2 Not in Bartsch; an impression at Windsor, RCIN 20117.
4 Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. 1962.119.10; Bean and Turčič 1982, no. 84; Van der Sman 2000, p. 69; Van der Sman 2003, no. iv.11.
85. **A man from behind c.1555**

Black and white chalks, with white heightening and brown oil paint, on blue paper

36.8 × 18.8 cm

**Provenance**

Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 85, *Scuola Veneziana*, among '38 to 43. *Tintoretto*)

**References**

Tietze and Tietze-Conrat 1944, no. 1759; Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 952; Roberts 1986, no. 35

The drawing is a study for the turbaned man at the foot of a ladder in the centre of Tintoretto’s canvas of the *Crucifixion*, painted for the church of San Severo, Venice, removed in 1791 and now in the Accademia (fig. 109). Surprisingly, the canvas is not documented and has been remarkably widely dated, between the 1540s and 1560s, but most recent scholars have recognised in the painting Tintoretto’s closest engagement with the works of Paolo Veronese, shortly after that artist arrived in Venice in 1553.¹

The drawing is a finely preserved example of Tintoretto’s characteristic drawing style, working with his usual media of black chalk on blue paper, here heightened with both white chalk and white lead, and with the line of the cross in the final composition added, probably later, with a couple of strokes of brown oil paint. Such drawings must have been executed in huge numbers by the artist, but they were the epitome of the preparatory sketch, dashed off to capture a pose and of little use to the artist once their immediate purpose had passed, and only a small proportion survive. Rearick emphasised the conservatism of Tintoretto’s drawing habits, pointing out that although he sometimes added pen, wash and white to his chalk drawings, and occasionally worked with brush and ink, he apparently never worked in pen and ink or pen and wash alone, and never in red chalk.²

Two other drawings for the *Crucifixion* are known: a squared study of the soldiers dicing for Christ’s clothes (actually two separate drawings on two joined pieces of paper) in the Uffizi;³ and, less certainly connected with the painting, a sketch in the Courtauld Institute for the woman supporting the swooning Virgin.⁴

---

¹ Forlani 1956, p. 13; De Vecchi 1970, no. 108; Rossi 1975, p. 58; Pallucchini and Rossi 1974–82, no. 171, all dated the painting to 1554–5; Rearick however (1996, p. 174; 2001, p. 120) dated the painting and drawing to c.1551, implicitly rejecting the influence of Veronese.

² Rearick 1996.

³ Uffizi, inv. 13005-f.

⁴ Courtauld Institute, Seilern collection, inv. 369.
**ATTRIBUTED TO DOMENICO BRUSASORCI**

Verona c.1516–1567

86. *A prophet or philosopher c.1550–60*

Black and white chalks with grey-brown wash, on blue paper, lower left corner cut 40.8 × 25.4 cm

Inscribed upper left: *Paolo Calliari. T.*

Verso: *The torso of a male nude. Black chalk on blue paper*

**PROVENANCE**

Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 59, *Titiano Paolo Veronese e Scuola Veneziana*, among 29 to 42. Of Paolo Veronese and Carlo Cagliari)

**REFERENCES**

Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 1006; Cocke 1984, no. 224; Rearick 1988, no. 24

As the inscription (probably of the seventeenth century) shows, the drawing was traditionally attributed to Paolo Veronese (1528–88). This was tentatively accepted by Popham, and more enthusiastically and tenaciously by Rearick, who put forward at different times two hypotheses for the purpose of the drawing – an early idea for one of Veronese’s frescoed prophets high in San Sebastiano, Venice; or connected with Veronese’s work in the Libreria Marciana. Rearick advanced a scenario in which Veronese produced four canvases (with another planned in the Windsor drawing) in 1557, continuing the theme of the *tondi* painted (by artists including Veronese) in the ceiling, with a mixture of philosophers, scientists and allegories; it then became clear that the canvases were too small, and the decision was taken to abandon the first series and commission larger canvases with the figures in architectural niches designed by Sansovino himself.

There are indeed strong general resemblances between the Windsor drawing and Veronese’s niche-figures of the 1550s, but the style of the drawing seems irreconcilable with Veronese’s certain sheets. In rejecting the drawing, Cocke noted that ‘the detail with which the shadow is built up and the insistence on the silhouette achieve a powerful sculptural effect at odds with Veronese’s painterly chalk studies’. In response Rearick argued that the drawing belonged to a ‘transitional moment’, reasoning that Veronese early in his career remained deeply rooted in the Emilian principles that had first inspired him.

The argument of the ‘transitional moment’ is usually special pleading to explain a drawing that one would wish to be by an artist but whose style does not correspond with anything certainly by that draughtsman. This combination of complicated outline and busy, faceted internal modelling is not met with in the drawings of Veronese. There are, however, enough points of contact with his art to suggest that it is by a contemporary, and Sueur made the most convincing suggestion to date in proposing that it is in fact by Veronese’s compatriot Domenico Brusasorci.

Brusasorci’s drawn oeuvre is very sparse, and few sheets can be assigned to him with certainty. A drawing in Edinburgh, inscribed with the date 1547 and reasonably attributed to the artist, displays the Emilian roots of his eclectic style. By the following decade Brusasorci’s figures and compositions had solidified: the key work in reconstructing his drawn oeuvre, a study at Chatsworth for his altarpiece of the *Madonna and Child with Saints* in Sant’Eufemia, Verona, demonstrates a less decorative approach to the drapery, with a busy silhouette and stocky figures, as is also seen in a second sheet in Edinburgh, again attributed to the artist with some certainty. The monumentality of the present figure compares well with a study of *Saturn* in the Uffizi, with a sixteenth-century ascription to Brusasorci. The unusual technique of the present drawing, with many small strokes of wash over black and white chalks, is comparable to that of a sheet in the Louvre, also attributed to Brusasorci by Sueur. No project of Brusasorci’s is known for which the sheet might have served as a study, though a study of St Peter in a niche (reasonably attributed to the artist), and another drawing of a standing prophet (less certainly so) may have been for the same undertaking.

When the drawing was lifted from its old mount for the Veronese exhibition in Washington DC in 1988, an unusually large black-chalk drawing of a male nude was discovered on the verso (fig. 110). Unfortunately, too much of the chalk has been lost over the centuries to assess its style. The arms of the figure appear to be missing (as if it were a damaged sculpture), or pinioned behind his back. This is the plight of St Sebastian in Brusasorci’s Sant’Eufemia altarpiece, though the pose of the figure is not particularly close.

---

1 Rearick 1976–80, p. 54. A drawing in the Fogg Art Museum (1927.59) that Rearick cited to support this attribution is very different in style.

2 Rearick 1988, nos. 22–4; the drawing was also accepted by Coutts 1986, p. 400, placing it in the first half of the 1550s.

3 Cocke 1984, p. 187.


5 Sueur 1993, pp. 64–5, citing an attribution to Brusasorci by Philip Pouncey written on the verso of the old mount.

6 Edinburgh 2004, no. 92.

7 Jaffé (M.) 1994, no. 745.

8 Edinburgh 2004, no. 93.

9 Marinelli 2000, no. 23.

10 Sueur 1993, no. 11.


12 Uffizi, Mullaly 1971, no. 29.
87. **The Emperor Vespasian c.1560–80**

Black chalk, pen and ink, brush and ink, and white heightening on paper washed pale brown

39.4 × 27.0 cm


**Provenance**

William Gibson; probably acquired by Charles II; Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 117, Paolo Farinati, ‘A Spirited manner & not wanting in Invention but not correct in his Drawing.’)

**References**

Popham and Wilde 1949, no. 300; London 1983b, no. 17

Paolo Farinati worked in and around Verona throughout his career, producing many decorative cycles for private residences, only a small number of which survive. He also made quantities of chiaroscuro drawings such as this, some of which can be connected to paintings, but most of which may have been produced either to build up a stock of images for potential customers, or as finished sheets for sale. His heavy late Mannerist style changed little through his career, and dating his drawings on stylistic grounds is almost impossible.

This drawing is one of a set of eight by Farinati at Windsor depicting great men from ancient history: others show the Emperors Vitellius and Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great (three drawings), King Sapor of Persia and Attila the Hun. Further, there are elsewhere similar studies of the Emperor Antoninus Pius in the Ashmolean;6 of Mithridates, King of Pontus, in Edinburgh;3 and another of Vitellius, on the art market.4 All of these figures are shown standing in niches or on plinths, or seated on architectural elements, suggesting that they were intended to be painted illusionistically as part of an interior decoration scheme – most probably of a library, as libraries were traditionally furnished with portraits of great men. Farinati painted in the Palazzo Guarienti alla Bra in Verona a room with depictions of the Twelve Caesars (emulating Titian’s cycle in the Palazzo Ducale, Mantua – cf. no. 39),5 but the drawings under consideration here, which include figures other than Roman emperors, must relate to a different project.

In inscriptions on both sides of the sheet (and on several others in the series), Farinati considers an associated medal of the Emperor. As Scrase noted, the lettering on the recto is derived from an actual coin of the Emperor,6 but on the verso of the sheet (fig. 111) the artist suggests two possible reverses for a medal of his own invention.

Farinati’s drawings were esteemed by seventeenth-century English collectors, and the Royal Collection now holds about fifty sheets by him and his followers. Fourteen of these bear an inscription in a hand identifiable as that of the dealer William Gibson, and it is probable that most, if not all, of the Farinatis were acquired during the reign of Charles II. A list of albums at Kensington Palace in 1727 includes one volume entirely of drawings by Farinati, with others in a miscellaneous album.

---

1 Popham and Wilde 1949, nos. 299–301, 303–7.
2 Parker 1956, no. 213.
4 Sotheby’s, 4 July 1975, lot 194.
6 London 1983b, p. 236.
THE

SEVENTEENTH

CENTURY
ANNIBALE CARRACCI
Bologna 1560–Rome 1609

88. An Allegory of Truth and Time c. 1584–5

Oil on canvas
130.0 x 169.6 cm
RCIN 404770

PROVENANCE
Possibly recorded at Hampton Court in the reign of Queen Anne, c.1710. At Buckingham Palace during the reign of Queen Victoria

REFERENCES
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According to his biographer, Malvasia, Annibale Carracci was the son of a tailor and trained with his cousin Ludovico (1555–1619; see nos. 111, 120). His early work also shows the influence of the Bolognese artist Bartolomeo Passerotti. Annibale must have learned engraving from his brother Agostino (1557–1602; see no. 112). Annibale visited Parma in 1580 in order to study the work of Correggio (nos. 34–5), and Venice in 1581–2 to study Titian, Tintoretto and Veronese (nos. 58–61 and 75–7).

Perhaps the single most important event in the history of late sixteenth-century Italian painting was the formation in the early 1580s of an informal art academy in Bologna by the three Carracci, Ludovico, Agostino and Annibale. They insisted on study from the life as the foundation of artistic practice, consciously rejecting Mannerist artificiality and training many of the artists (including Domenichino, Guido Reni, Giovanni Lanfranco and Francesco Albani – see nos. 116–19, 132) who were to form the first wave of the full Baroque in Italy.

The new studio-academy encouraged a re-evaluation of the north Italian masters of the previous century, in particular Correggio, Titian and Veronese; a respect (but not veneration) for classical antiquity; and a hostility towards the theory and the practice of Giorgio Vasari (no. 9) and Florentine Mannerism.

During these years the three artists collaborated on fresco decoration within Bolognese palaces: the Palazzo Fava illustrated with scenes from the story of Jason in 1583–4, and the Palazzo Magnani with scenes from the story of Romulus and Remus in 1588–92. At the same time Annibale, the most talented and innovative of the three, produced a body of his own work, of which this painting is an important example. In 1595 he entered the service of Cardinal Odoardo Farnese in Rome, remaining with him for ten years and producing his greatest work, the frescoes in the Palazzo Farnese from 1597 to 1601. In Rome he studied classical sculpture and the work of the High Renaissance, particularly Raphael and Michelangelo. Soon after his death Annibale had his ideal, classical vision of nature being seen as the perfect corrective to the fantasy of Mannerism and the brutal realism of Caravaggio.

No specific source for the subject of this painting has been identified. Annibale probably consulted books such as Vincenzo Cartari’s mythography Le immagini con la spositione de i dei de gli antichi first published in Venice in 1556 and with illustrations in 1571, compiled from classical sources such as Pliny. The moral of the painting would seem to correspond to two famous sayings (also current in English): ‘The truth will out’ and ‘All’s well that ends well’. In the centre of the composition Time has brought his daughter, Truth, from the depths of a well to reveal her to the light of day. Time famously flies (hence the wings) and holds an hourglass; Truth is light (which explains her sunburst halo) and looks at herself in a mirror, which presents a true image of the world. Truth tramples underfoot a figure personifying Deceit (sometimes called Fraud, Hypocrisy or Calumnny). After its most recent restoration malevolent animal’s features were revealed at the back of her head, so that she is literally ‘two-faced’. This central drama is framed by two symbolic figures, arranged like caryatids. On the right is Bonus Eventus, literally Happy Ending, who refers to the happy issue of enterprises and holds corn and poppies and scatters flowers. The figure on the left may represent Felicity (Happiness), with cornucopia to signify plenty and a winged caduceus for peace, or alternatively Buona Fortuna (Good Luck), who bears similar attributes but is also traditionally shown, as here, with wings.

Many of the details of the composition were worked out on the canvas during the process of painting, and the numerous resulting pentiments are now clearly visible. On the left-hand side sky has been painted over trees, whose foliage once extended to the top edge of the canvas. Truth’s right arm and Buona Fortuna’s left hand have both moved slightly, as have both arms of the figure of Deceit and Bonus Eventus’s left arm and right leg. There is a drawing, executed in black and red chalk and coloured washes (Fogg Art Museum), which appears to be the final design for a Judgement of Paris, although no painting made from it survives. The apparent date of the drawing, the format and even the composition are so similar to this Allegory as to suggest that Annibale might originally have planned a pair of paintings dealing with the theme of Good and Bad Judgement and their consequences.

This painting is an excellent example of Annibale Carracci’s study of north Italian painting: the idea of a complex bespoke allegory and the general arrangement of figures, architecture and landscape derive from Titian’s famously enigmatic allegory, now called Sacred and Profane Love, of c. 1515 (Borghese Gallery, Rome). The facial types, the elegant, boneless hands and the slightly acidic colours show the influence of Correggio and of his highly successful follower, Federico Barocci (1526–1612).

It was not the Renaissance elements that struck Annibale’s contemporaries, but rather his modern naturalism, a weighty materiality of figure and landscape that counterbalances the painting’s cerebral allegorical subject. Most striking here, and in other Annibale paintings of these years such as the Baptism of Christ of 1585 (San Gregorio, Bologna), is his naturalistic depiction of figures out of doors, seen here in the starkly sunlit figure of Truth. Annibale’s directness combined with the inventiveness of his composition and bold colours transform the north Italian influences and herald his future achievements in the Palazzo Farnese in Rome.
1 Tervarent 1944, pp. 95–6; Cartari 1571, pp. 482, 486–7.
2 Tervarent 1944 identifies 'Felicity' as 'Fortune', because of her wings.
3 Conservation carried out by Rupert Featherstone in 1988. The painting has experienced some abrasion in the past, causing the ground to show through in many areas. This has made some of the modelling of the figures less distinct and with more abrupt transitions between highlights and mid-tones than the artist originally intended. The well-preserved drapery of Buona Fortuna gives some idea of what the whole painting might once have looked like.
4 Mongan and Sachs 1940, no. 80; Ottawa 1982, no. 26.
5 First attributed to Annibale by Longhi and Voss (cautiously) in 1929 (letters in the Royal Collection picture files: Longhi 29 April 1929; Voss 28 April 1929) and now almost universally accepted as by him. The painting is also discussed by Mahon in Bologna 1956, no. 53; Boschloo 1974, i, pp. 71–2, ii, pp. 176, 191, 211; DeGrazia 1984, no. 124; Dempsey in Washington 1988b, pp. 248–51; Benati in Bologna 2006, pp. 164–5.
ANNIBALE CARRACCI
Bologna 1560–Rome 1609

89. Head of a Man in Profile c.1588–95

Oil on canvas
44.8 x 32.1 cm
RCIN 405471

PROVENANCE
Probably acquired by Frederick, Prince of Wales, by 1750
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This vivid head is precisely the type of study from everyday life practised so passionately by the three Carracci in drawings and paintings in their early years in Bologna. A similar directness and looseness of handling is seen in Annibale's early portraits and the extraordinary group of genre paintings: the Boy Drinking of c.1582–3 (Christ Church, Oxford); Bean Eater of 1583–4 (Galleria Colonna, Rome); Two Children Teasing a Cat of c.1588–90 (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York); and The Butcher's Shop of c.1582 (Christ Church, Oxford, once in Charles I's collection).1 These studies from nature, painted with such sympathy and with broad open brushwork, were in deliberate contrast to the dry, 'statuesque' style of the previous generation of Mannerist painters. The Carracci sometimes used the word pastosità ('pastiness' or 'impatto') to describe their work. Venetian painting – particularly that of Veronese, Titian and Tintoretto – is clearly important. Venetian painting – particularly that of Veronese, Carracci sometimes used the word pastosità ('pastiness' or 'impatto') to describe their work.

The head is probably one of the 'two Carachis, by themselves' seen by George Vertue in the collection of Prince Frederick in 1750 (boldly painted heads are often assumed to be self-portraits). It may have been recommended to the Prince by one of his artistic advisers, Major-General John Guise (1682/3–1765), whose collection included two of the early Carracci genre scenes mentioned above, the Boy Drinking and The Butcher's Shop. Annibale's reputation was high in eighteenth-century England, with these spontaneous paintings singled out for praise by critics such as Jonathan Richardson and Joshua Reynolds.3 Subsequent Royal Collection cataloguers lost sight of the attribution, listing the painting without an artist's name, or giving it to Titian and even Sebastiano Ricci. Longhi was the first to reattribute the painting to Annibale in an unpublished letter in 1929 and a review in 1960, dating it to c.1583.4

The attribution is not without complications. Most writers recognise Annibale's quality and touch in this painting but find it difficult to match against any of his other portraits. Levey compared it to the Portrait of a Man (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), dating both to the late 1580s.5 Posner (and others) attributes the Munich portrait to Agostino Carracci and he is cautious about accepting the Royal Collection portrait as by Annibale.6 He draws attention to many pictorial qualities – the strong colours, fluid treatment, the cool tonality of the green coat, the thin layer of blue over the background brown – which, he claims, cannot be found in secure Annibale portraits of this date: the Portrait of a Man (Pitti Palace, Florence); the so-called Self-portrait (Uffizi; fig. 112) or the Portrait of an Old Man (Jean-Luc Baroni, London).

One might argue against this that the Uffizi Self-portrait has the freely handled shirt, and that both it and particularly the Baroni have something of the extraordinary touch of this portrait, which has very little pastosità. Small, informal and private portraits of this type are notoriously difficult to date: it may be that it was painted as late as c.1595, when Annibale had developed a more translucent, spontaneous touch, though his official commissions of this date would have been given a much more polished finish.

The portrait may have been painted in exchange for goods. According to Malvasia this was a habit of Annibale's in Bologna: he acquired a new hat in exchange for a portrait of the hatmaker's wife, for 'he was unable to turn down even the barber or the cobbler who patched his shoes when they asked him to do their portrait or make a little picture of the Madonna to keep by their bed'.7

1 Byam Shaw 1967, nos. 180, 181, pp. 100–102.
3 Vertue, 'Miscellaneous Papers', British Library Add. MS19027, fol. 22v., August 1750. Jonathan Richardson in 1725: Annibale Carracci was rather Great, than Gentle. ... Tis no Objection against a Sketch if it be left Unfinish'd, and with Bold Rough Touches, tho' it be Little, and to be seen Near.' Richardson (J.) 1725, pp. 166, 206; in 1769 Reynolds praised the 'scrupulous exactness' of Annibale's life sketches. See Evans in Cardiff 1998, p. 47, no. 26.
4 Redgrave sheet, dated 8 December 1862, inscribed Titian and Ricci added in a later hand. In 1929 Longhi suggested Annibale Carracci (letter in the Royal Collection picture files), an idea also mentioned by Collins Baker (1929, p. 122). Exhibited in 1960 as by Sebastiano Ricci (London 1960, no. 121), it was associated with the group of Ricci studies of heads after Veronese. The attribution to Annibale was published by Longhi (1960, p. 60) in a review of this exhibition, followed by Levey (1991), Nicolson (1965, p. 476) and Lewine and Wittkower (1967, no. 1).
5 S. Pepper (1972, pp. 263–4) accepted it, saw particular similarities with the Portrait of an Old Woman (private collection), and dated these two and the Baroni portrait to c.1593 (but in 1973, pp. 130–3, dated it in the 1580s); Cooney and Malafarina 1976 to c.1593, 1588–90; Berati in Bologna 2006, pp. 100–101, c.1582–3.
7 Exhibited in Mahon 1956, no. 70.
8 Posner 1971, ii, p. 25, no. 54.
to by the resemblance of the table to an altar or tomb and the shroud-like cloth on which he sleeps. The cherries, of which one has already been eaten, symbolise heaven as ‘fruits of paradise’. The Virgin may be read as cautioning John not to awaken Christ to his Passion before his time. There is a black chalk and pen and ink preparatory drawing for the whole composition (previously in the Duke of Sutherland’s collection), including the figure of John reaching out to touch Christ. This gesture is similar to that of the putto touching a spine of the crown of thorns in Annibale’s *Pietà* (Capodimonte, Naples), which dates from the same period. The sharing of the motif suggests that Annibale was working out ideas for both paintings at the same time. In both *Il Silenzio* and the *Pietà* there is a carefully balanced pyramid composition, with the crucial gesture of the Virgin holding the centre. Annibale may have seen Sebastiano del Piombo’s very Michelangelesque version of the subject (Capodimonte, Naples; fig. 114) of the 1530s, as it was in the Farnese collection at this time. Annibale probably derived the gesture of enjoining silence from Michelangelo: in a red chalk presentation drawing by him (private collection), usually dated to the 1540s, the Holy Family is shown with an older John the Baptist and it is he rather than Mary who puts his finger to his lips. Such a considered use of Renaissance sources gives *Il Silenzio* grandeur despite its modest size. Each form is clearly delineated with the classical restraint typical of Carracci’s style at this time. In the subdued atmosphere the figures emerge from deep shadows. Annibale also pays close attention to details, such as the children’s delicate curls, the fringe of the Virgin’s turban, the cherries and the finely painted fingers. The Christ Child has the weight of natural sleep, his stomach relaxed, his mouth slightly open, but his hand is paler than his mother’s on which he rests, alluding to his future death. Annibale made small but important changes, some clearly visible, others only in infra-red reflectography and x-radiography, as he devised this strong and deceptively simple composition.

The painting was much copied, reinterpreted and quoted, especially after it was acquired by George III in 1766. A squared-up composition by Sassoferrato is perhaps related to the most notable copy of the painting attributed to Domenichino (Louvre) which was probably painted c.1605, and therefore very shortly after the original. The painting was engraved by Bartolozzi while it was at Buckingham House in 1768; Dalton, who bought the painting for George III, owned the preparatory drawing. Francis Cotes’s *Queen Charlotte with the Princess Royal* of 1767 (Royal Collection) depicts the Queen silencing the viewer with her raised figure, so as not to wake the sleeping princess, as a homage to the recent acquisition.

**Provenance**

Recorded in the Farnese collection in the Palazzo del Giardino, Parma, 1678 and c.1680; purchased for George III by Richard Dalton, 27 May 1766, for £262 (W.R.A., Geo. 17153)

**References**

Levey 1991, no. 432; Posner 1971, i, pp. 109–110; ii, no. 122

This small devotional painting dates from the time when Annibale Carracci was completing his greatest work, the Palazzo Farnese ceiling in Rome, which merged Roman Classicism with the study of natural forms. The idea of Christ asleep prefiguring his death is found in Raphael’s composition, the *Madonna of the Diadem* (Louvre; fig. 113), which explores the theme of the *Madonna of the veil* (see no. 8), in which the lifting of the veil is a symbol of revelation, alluding to the cloth covering the chalice at Mass and the sheet that covered the dead Christ. Christ’s future sacrifice is alluded

---

**Oil on canvas**

51.2 × 68.4 cm

**RCIN 404702**

**Fig. 113** Attributed to Giovanni Francesco Penni, *Madonna of the Diadem*; oil on poplar panel, 68.0 × 48.7 cm (Musée du Louvre, Paris)

**Fig. 114** Sebastiano del Piombo, *Madonna del Velo*; oil on slate, 118.0 × 88.0 cm (Museo di Capodimonte, Naples)
1 The *Madonna of the Diadem* is attributed to Giovanni Francesco Penni. Meyer zur Capellen 2005, ii.49 and no. 51 for Raphael’s related *Madonna di Loreto*, c.1512 (Musée Condé, Chantilly).

2 For a discussion of the iconography see Firestone 1944, pp. 43–62; Copertini 1939, pp. 99–103.

3 Jameson 1902, p. 125; Posner 1971, p. 52.


5 Posner 1971, i, no. 219, painted for Cardinal Farnese and in the Palazzo del Giardino in 1680.


8 De Tolnay 1975–80, v, pp. 65, 193–4, fig. 158.

9 The painting was conserved by Rosanna de Sancha in 2003. The background is made up of cool grey-blue layers of paint to which Annibale added a copper green layer in the area around the figures. A fold of her blue mantle lay along the Virgin’s right shoulder, as in the Domenichino copy, and her turban extended higher. The bolster may have extended further to the right, as in the copies.

10 See Levey 1991 and Posner 1971 for the many copies and versions. See also Spear 1982, i, no. 20.
Caravaggio was probably the most influential painter of the early seventeenth century. He was the son of Fermo Merisi, who came from Caravaggio in Lombardy, and was brought up in Milan. In 1584 he was apprenticed to Simone Peterzano in Milan, where he must have been exposed to Lombard naturalism, Venetian colour and painterly application, and the chiaroscuro of Leonardo and his followers. In the summer of 1592 he travelled to Rome, where he moved between patrons, studios and dealers in search of work. Giulio Mancini, an early biographer of Caravaggio, records that in his early years in Rome he stayed with and worked for a beneficed priest of St Peter’s, Monsignor Pandolfo Pucci, referred to as ‘Monsignor Insalata’ (‘Mr Salad’) on account of the meagre fare offered to lodgers. At this time Caravaggio lived by hack-work, producing copies of devotional works and small half-length single-figure compositions for the open market. In about 1593 he moved to the house of the Mannerist painter Cavaliere d’Arpino and his brother Bernardino, where Bellori, another biographer, states that he painted flowers and fruit. It was not until some time in the mid-1590s, when Caravaggio was taken up by Cardinal del Monte and lodged in his palace, that his career really took off.

There are a handful of references in contemporary sources to this composition, which dates from Caravaggio’s early struggling years in Rome. One of the first paintings mentioned in Mancini’s biography is a ‘boy peeling a pear with a knife’ (in later editions the fruit becomes an apple).1 There is also a record of an unattributed painting of a ‘young boy seated at a table with an apple in his hand’ confiscated in 1607 from Cavaliere d’Arpino’s studio and given by Pope Paul V to his nephew, Cardinal Scipione Borghese. This painting does not appear in the 1693 inventory of the Borghese collection.² A letter of 16 August 1608 from Lorenzo Sarego in Perugia to Cardinal Scipione Borghese mentions a half-length painting of a boy peeling a peach by Caravaggio, which had turned up in the estate of the Perugian collector Cesare Crispolti.³ From these records it appears either that Caravaggio painted several versions of this composition or that others, perhaps from within his circle, made copies or variants of them.⁴

Today at least ten versions survive, all showing the peeling of citrus fruit, probably a green Seville or Bergamot orange (rather than an apple, peach or pear), with other fruit scattered on the table — peaches, cherries and nectarines.⁵ They belong with a group of quite small paintings dated c.1593–7, all depicting half-length youths against simple backgrounds, evocatively lit, with prominent still lifes in the foreground; other examples include the Self-portrait as Bacchus and Boy with a Basket of Fruit (both Galleria Borghese, Rome) and the Boy Bitten by a Lizard (National Gallery, London and Longhi collection, Florence). Caravaggio’s typically Lombard interest in recording reality as it was set in front of him, with posed model and still life, was to continue throughout his career. The awkwardness of the figure here compared with the Boy Bitten by a Lizard or Boy with a Basket of Fruit suggests that this is Caravaggio’s earliest surviving painting.⁶

Caravaggio’s skill at still-life painting was particularly praised by early biographers and he reputedly said that ‘good still-life painting required as much artistry as good figure painting’. Rudolf Wittkower was the first to suggest that these elements could be read emblematically, an example followed by later critics.⁷ The bitter fruit has been thought to allude to the surprises in store for the inexperienced boy, the corkscrew turn of the peel like the turn of Fortune’s wheel, although there is very little evidence that contemporaries read hidden meanings in paintings of this sort with such alacrity and ingenuity.⁸ The painting has also been related to the four seasons or the five senses, popular subjects among north Italian painters such as Jacopo Bassano, Vincenzo Campi and Bartolomeo Passerotti. The painting could allude to autumn, or to the sense of taste: one critic has suggested that the Boy Bitten by a Lizard and the Boy Peeling Fruit were painted as a pair, one representing touch and the other taste, which raises the question of what happened to the other three senses.⁹ It is more likely that the painting alludes to sensory experience in a more general way through its descriptive naturalism, as if saying to the viewer, ‘this fruit is so lifelike that you can feel it, smell it and taste it, as well as seeing it’.

There are several fine versions of this composition with claims to be original works by Caravaggio and no reason to suppose that there must be only one such original. The versions in the Ishizuka collection, Tokyo, and Dickinson, London (fig. 115) have both been accepted as by Caravaggio: the latter uses his characteristic brown underpainting, left visible in the shadows, and has a number of small pentiments.¹⁰ The way in which the
broken folds of the boy’s shirt in the Tokyo version are painted has been compared to the work of Cavaliere d’Arpino, which may suggest that it was executed when Caravaggio was in his studio. A version in a private collection in Rome, proposed as by Caravaggio by Marini in 1978, also has some pentiments, but its larger format, including both of the boy’s arms and two additional fruits, suggests that it is an amplified repetition of the composition rather than the unique prototype.  

There is also a strong case to be made that the Royal Collection version is an – if not the – original. The fact that it was recorded in the James II inventory as by ‘Michael Angelo’ (Caravaggio’s Christian name) means that it was already thought to be by Caravaggio in the seventeenth century. The folds of the boy’s shirt are less smooth and finished than in the other versions, having the broken liveliness of the shirt of the Boy with a Basket of Fruit. This work also shares with other early paintings by Caravaggio an undercurrent of expressive, Venetian-type brushwork, seen in the drapery and still life and missing from the other versions. There is a grey ground characteristic of Caravaggio at this date. There are a number of pentiments: pink flesh shows through the white of the boy’s right sleeve, which was originally more rolled up, an alteration that a copyist would not need to make; the outline of his right upper arm was altered. The knife handle was painted after the two ears of corn. Flesh painting extends under the shirt on his left side. Just above the fruit there are dark shapes created by two leaves, which have been painted over with strokes of white; with age the white has become more transparent and the leaves more visible. These dark shapes have been repeated in other versions, including those in Tokyo, London and Rome, but without the leaves underneath, which suggests that they were copied unthinkingly from this painting. They are there made to look like shadows cast by the thumb, fruit and knife, though the direction of light makes this impossible.

1 Marucchi 1956–7, i, p. 224.
2 Gregori (New York 1985, pp. 200–203) discusses Cinotti’s point that the description ‘un putto in tavola con un pomo in mano’ suggests that the painting was on panel (tavola), which would rule out this painting, which is on canvas. She suggests that in tavola can be read as ‘at a table’, and is therefore a description of the composition. See also Hibbard 1983, pp. 15–17; Langdon 1988, pp. 51–76; Paglisi 2002, pp. 52–69.
3 ASV, Carte Borghese, 54/5; Gregori in New York 1985, pp. 200–201.
4 The author is grateful to John Gash for his advice on this question.
6 The Boy Bitten by a Lizard (National Gallery, London) is more sophisticated than our painting and must be a later version of the theme.
8 Mahon in Nicolson 1979, p. 34, and Spike in Sydney 2003, pp. 82–3, 227. It has also been related to a popular proverb: see Röttgen 1974, pp. 186, 251, note 126, and to the idea of Christian redemption, Calvesi 1971, pp. 95–8.
9 Wind (1975 p. 72, note 4) related it to the four seasons; Bauch (1996, p. 260) related it to the five senses in northern prints. Costello (1981, p. 375), who proposed the idea of a pair, linked it to the Five Senses by Frans Floris, engraved by Hieronymous Cock in 1561.
10 The Tokyo painting (65 × 52 cm) was owned by Reynolds; Reynolds sale 1795; Earl of Inchnauny by 1805; Marquise de Plessis-Bellières by 1897; sold Christie’s, London, 28 November 1927, no. 125 (attributed to Le Nain); S. F. Sahin by 1952; see Gregori in New York 1985, no. 61. Also exhibited Bergamo 2000, no. 8; London 2001, no. 1. The Dickinson painting (64.2 × 51.4 cm) from an English private collection was sold at Phillips, London, 10 December 1996, no. 67; exhibited Sydney 2003, pp. 82–3, 227; Düsseldorf 2006, no. 27. The boy’s right eye was lowered by 8 mm from its original position; the knuckles of his right hand were lengthened and the thumb elevated (Phillips 1996, p. 108).
11 For the Rome painting (75.5 × 64.4 cm) see Marini 1987, pp. 112–13, 339–61 and Marini in Bergamo 2000, no. 9 with x-ray. The head was originally higher and to the right, the shoulders altered, the left hand and neckline of the shirt changed. The painting does have an eighteenth-century seal of Cardinal Tiberio Borghese on the back. Also exhibited Düsseldorf 2006, no. 28.
12 The painting was conserved in 1977 and 2006 by Rupert Featherstone, who suggested the reattribution to Caravaggio. It is now slightly wider, some of the painted canvas (about 1 cm on each side) having been turned around both vertical edges.
13 1688 inventory, BL Harl. ms 1890, fol. 63. Moir and Marini attributed the painting to Mario Minitti (1577–1640). By the middle of the nineteenth century the attribution had been changed to Murillo, perhaps to match the version (now in Tokyo) that Reynolds owned and exhibited as by Murillo in 1791. Gregori in New York 1985, p. 202.
CARAVAGGIO (MICHELANGELO MERISI)
Milan or Caravaggio 1571–Porto Ercole 1610

92. The Calling of Sts Peter and Andrew c.1602–4

Oil on canvas
140.1 x 112.0 cm
RCIN 402824

PROVENANCE
Bought by Charles I from William Frizell in 1637; valued at £40 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to De Critz and others on 18 November 1651; recovered at the Restoration
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The subject comes from St Mark’s Gospel (1: 16–18): Jesus saw Simon (later called Peter) and his brother Andrew fishing by the Sea of Galilee and said, ‘Follow me and I will make you become fishers of men’. A young Christ, unusually shown without a beard, gestures out of the painting in the direction in which he is moving, while turning back to the two brothers. Peter holds two fish skewered on sticks and starts back in surprise; Andrew points to himself incredulously. The composition seems to imply that Christ will walk calmly off to the right, without looking back again, and that the other two figures (after a due period of astonishment and reluctance) will find themselves following.

With a few exceptions, scholars have believed that the Royal Collection picture records a Caravaggio design, which is also known through eleven other versions.¹ All twelve versions were thought to be copies of a lost original until, in 1987, Maurizio Marini suggested that the Royal Collection version might be that original, a view gaining acceptance.² Recent conservation of the painting has helped to resolve the question.³ Examination of the painting revealed that an expressive furrowing of Christ’s brow was not part of Caravaggio’s original idea, but had been caused by damage to the paint surface (or rather by the discolouration of the early touching out of the damage). This ‘frown’ occurs in two versions of the painting, at Weston Park and formerly Chatsworth, which were clearly copied from the Royal Collection painting, probably in the late seventeenth century. Conservation has also revealed the dynamism of the composition: Peter’s right arm, which previously read as flat, now seems to project out of the front of the picture plane (thrusting the fish under our noses) in an effect typical of Caravaggio. The relationship between his two hands and the figure of Christ establishes a diagonal recession into space, which was illegible before the painting was cleaned. We can also now appreciate the contrast between Christ’s long, pale fingers and the weatherbeaten hands with which these working fishermen express their surprise, confusion and fear. The face of Christ and his hands are the most fully lit of the scene, while those of his disciples are in more shadow. The paint was applied swiftly but accurately, though Caravaggio made numerous small but significant changes as the composition progressed.⁴ Also characteristic of his later work is the use of the priming colour as a middle tone, visible in the completed work – in this case on the fingers of the figures, and between areas of colour in Christ’s greenish-blue drapery.

No drawings by Caravaggio have been identified, and it is likely that he painted directly onto the canvas. To help him he developed the unprecedented method of incising the lower paint layers (perhaps with some form of stylus) to mark out the important positions in his composition.⁵ Many such incisions are visible here, around the ear of Andrew, covered with hair in the painting, and mapping out crucial lines around the head of Christ, his eyebrows, shoulder line and lower sleeve.⁶ The blue of Christ’s robe has been seen as an argument against the attribution: according to Bellori, Caravaggio did not use cinnabar red and azure blue, ‘and if sometimes he may have chosen them, he softened them, saying that they were the poison of colours’.⁷ The blue used here is certainly unusual for Caravaggio, although he uses blue in the Betrayal of Christ (National Gallery of Ireland) of c. 1603 and the Annunciation (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Nancy) of c. 1604–5. However, restoration has revealed that the colour was modulated to a rich greenish-blue in the highlights but a dark, almost indigo colour in the shadows, which perhaps qualifies as the type of ‘softening’ Bellori mentions.
Placing this work within Caravaggio’s career is hampered by the fact that there is no record of his having painted such a subject. For many years the composition was linked to a painting described by early biographers Giulio Mancini and Giovanni Baglione as a ‘Christ who goes to Emmaus’. It clearly does not depict the pilgrimage to Emmaus – an episode in which fish play no part – though it is just possible that both authors misread the subject.

This ‘Christ who goes to Emmaus’ is now generally thought to be a reference to the Supper at Emmaus of 1601 (National Gallery, London). Without documentary anchors the Royal Collection painting can only be dated stylistically and seems to belong in the period 1602–4, painted in the years before Caravaggio fled Rome, having killed a man in a duel in May 1606. Compared with the Supper at Emmaus the technique is economical, the brushwork broad, the colour restrained and the detail minimal. In Caravaggio’s art during the years 1601–6 sensuous surface detail gives way to a spare, dark and expressive manner. The technique looks forward here to the Supper at Emmaus of 1605–6 (Brera), in which Christ again wears a greenish-blue robe. It can be related more closely to two other compositions where a small group of half-length figures interact intensely against a dark void: the Doubting Thomas (Sanssouci, Potsdam; fig. 116) and the Dublin Betrayal of Christ, both of c. 1602–3.

The only other hint as to the history of this painting before it reached England is provided by the interesting early copy of the painting by Bernardo Strozzi (private collection; fig. 117) in which the effect is lighter and a lobster replaces a fish in Peter’s catch. Strozzi worked in Genoa until his move to Venice in 1630. He may have seen Caravaggio’s painting on a visit to Rome, but it is also possible that it had found its way to Genoa, perhaps in the collection of one of Caravaggio’s patrons, such as Vincenzo Giustiniani, Ottavio Costa or Prince Marcantonio Doria, who had connections with that city. It was in 1637, only a few decades after its execution, that the painting was acquired for Charles I by his agent, William Frizell. As well as working for the King, Frizell assisted William Petty in various tasks in Italy in Lord Arundel’s service (see p. 28 above). We know that he landed in Livorno and must have travelled to several Italian cities in 1637, including Rome and Naples, though there is no record of his visiting Genoa. The painting appears in the Royal Collection inventory of c. 1639 by Van der Doort as ‘the 3. disciples Coming from fishing said to be don by one at
Room who is an – Immetato' of Caravagio’ in his list of Frizell’s pictures.11 The phrase ‘at Room’ could imply that Frizell bought the painting in Rome. It was listed at the Commonwealth Sale as ‘thre Fisher men. done by Mich. Angelo Cororagio’.12 Horace Walpole annotated the entry in his copy of the James II 1688 inventory with ‘It is now over a door at Windsor, & is one of the finest pictures the King has’.13

1 Wagner (1958, p. 230) denied any involvement of Caravaggio; Hibbard (1983, p. 294) felt that the design might be Bolognese. The versions are listed in Moir 1976, p. 110.
2 Levey (1991, no. 424) summarised previous opinion and did not believe that the painting was by Caravaggio. Some earlier scholars did, for example Voss (1924, p. 689, and letter of 28 April 1929) and Longhi (letter 27 May 1929). Marini (1987, no. 29) also suggested that the painting might be original (letter of 3 April 1997 in the Royal Collection picture files); Gash (2003, p. 75) supported this attribution. The author is grateful for his helpful suggestions.
3 Conservation carried out by Rupert Featherstone. A ‘CR’ cipher was revealed on the back of the original canvas during relining.
4 Caravaggio adjusted the lower lid of Christ’s left eye; the abozzo stroke lying in the initial position is visible in the lower lid, and there are similar strokes in the hair of Christ (seeming to show a parting), and indicating the positions of his right ear and St Peter’s chin. The position of Christ’s left ear is also indicated by an underlying stroke of paint, but in a deep red lake colour. There are pentiments in St Andrew’s hand and lower neck, in the line of Christ’s falling drapery on the extreme lower right and in the neckline of Christ (to left of head).
6 The pentiment in the neckline is also where there are several parallel short incisions comparable to those found in the St John on Patmos (Palazzo Corsini, Rome); see Cardinale et al. 2005, p. 48.
7 ‘Non si trova però che egli usasse cinabri, nè azzurri nelle sue figure; e se pure tal volta li havesse adoperati, li ammorzava, dicendo ch’erano il veleno delle tinte’, Bellori 1672, p. 212.
8 Baglione (1995 edn, i, p. 137) refers to a scene ‘quando N. Signore ando in Emmaus’ painted for the Roman nobleman Cirico Mattei; Mancini refers to a ‘Christo che va in Emmaus’ bought by Orazio Costa, Friedlaender 1954, pp. 232 and 236; see Law 1881, Collins Baker 1929, Reade 1947, Voss (1924) and Friedlaender (1955, p. 168, no. 19) suggested that no. 92 was a copy of a lost Walk to Emmaus.
9 Levey (1991, no. 424) pointed out that there are none of the attributes of pilgrims associated with the Emmaus story here.
10 Marini (1987, p. 142) has pointed out these strong Genoese links.
11 Millar 1960, p. 11, no. 12, p. 181, no. 12, p. 203.
12 Millar 1972a, p. 315, no. 263.
CRISTOFANO ALLORI
Florence 1577–1621

93. Judith with the Head of Holofernes 1613

Oil on canvas
120.4 × 100.3 cm
Inscribed at the end of the bed in lower right: Hoc Cristofori Allorii / Bronzini opere
natura / hactenus invicta pene / vincitur Anno 1613
RCIN 404989

PROVENANCE
Probably the picture listed in the Mantuan inventory of the inheritance of Duke Vincenzo Gonzaga, January 1627; perhaps the 'Judith with Holophernes head' in the Gallery at St James’s, described in Van der Doort’s inventory 1639 as 'Copied after Bronzino'; a 'Judith pr. Bronsino' was appraised at £60 at St James’s, February 1650, and 'Judic, par Bronsino', also £60, was on the Somerset House list, May 1650; possibly the unattributed picture of this subject returned by Lord Lisle after the Restoration; Charles II inventory, c.1666–7; Whitehall

REFERENCE
Shearman 1983, no. 2

Cristofano Allori trained with his father, Alessandro, who had in turn trained with Bronzino (no. 7), whose name both Alloris adopted (and appears in the inscription here). Cristofano’s early work, such as the Portrait of Ugo of Tuscany (Uffizi), demonstrates the influence of his father’s Bronzino-inspired Mannerism. Yet by the first decade of the seventeenth century Allori had begun to develop a distinctive artistic personality. Reacting against Mannerist artificiality, he placed emphasis on clarity of form and subject matter. In the art of his fellow Florentines Jacopo da Empoli and Domenico Passignano, Allori discovered a more direct and naturalistic manner. His emotive style aimed to actively engage his viewers, particularly in his penetrating portrait studies. An accomplished draughtsman, his many preparatory drawings for major commissions provide significant evidence of his laborious working method. Supported by influential patrons, including the Medici, Allori enjoyed a distinguished reputation, and through the paintings of his large workshop his artistic legacy continued long after his death in 1621.

According to his biographer Baldinucci, Allori painted this work in part as an autobiographical account of his love affair with Maria di Giovanni Mazzafirri, which ended badly. The figure of Judith, Baldinucci claimed, resembles ‘La Mazzafirra’, the servant in the background her mother, and the severed head of Goliath is a portrait of the artist himself. The artist’s inclusion of the inscription in the lower right-hand corner of the painting hints at the self-referential nature of the work. When Allori’s contemporary the poet Giambattista Marino saw a version of this painting in Paris, he specifically read the work as autobiographical, commenting that Holofernes is killed twice, first by the darts of Cupid and second by the sword of Judith.

Allori was by no means unique amongst his artistic contemporaries in his desire to make the story relevant to his own experience. According to the apocryphal Book of Judith, the pious Israelite widow Judith enters the camp of the Assyrian general Holofernes, and gains his confidence by seeming to betray her people. On the third night he plans to seduce her after an intimate feast in his tent, but instead succumbs to drink. At this point Judith decapitates him with his own sword and brings his head back to her people.

As the existence of numerous versions of the subject by the artist and his workshop attests, this subject became one of Allori’s best-known compositions. This is an especially fine early rendering. Even though carefully executed preparatory drawings have been identified for this work (see fig. 118), Allori seems to have made numerous small adjustments to the composition while painting. Later versions of the same subject, including that of 1620 in the Pitti Palace, are more firmly executed and lack the vibrancy and painterly qualities of this one.

The work is characteristic of Allori’s use of rich colours and his sophisticated rendering of texture and form. The carefully conceived composition and the dramatically positioned head of Goliath, which seems about to emerge into the space of the beholder, add to the emotional intensity of the painting and clearly indicate why this influential work became emblematic of Florentine Baroque painting for centuries thereafter. AL

1 ‘By this work of Cristofano Allori Bronzino, nature, hitherto undefeated, is almost conquered, in the year 1613.’
2 Particularly useful for the life and work of Cristofano Allori are Pizzorusso 1982 and Chappell 1984.
3 Baldinucci 1845–7 edn ii, pp. 717–35
4 Marino 1620, p. 59; see also London 2005b, pp. 96–7.
5 The multiple versions of this subject by Allori and his workshop are discussed in Chappell 1984, pp. 78–81, and Shearman 1983, pp. 6–8.
6 Preparatory drawings are discussed by Shearman (1979, pp. 2–10) and Gregori (1977, ii, pp. 520–26).
7 Technical analysis has confirmed that the inscription on the Royal Collection work is contemporary with the rest of the painting; there seems no reason therefore to doubt the attribution or date, as some scholars have done.
GIOVANNI BATTISTA CARACCIolo (‘Battistello’)
Naples 1578–1635

94. **Cupid Sleeping c. 1618**

Oil on canvas
92.3 × 127.1 cm
RCIN 405747

**Provenance**
Recorded in the Gonzaga collection in 1627. Presumably bought by Charles I (his cipher was recorded on the back in 1870 by Redgrave); valued at £15 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to Turbridge 30 April 1650; recovered at the Restoration

**References**
Levey 1991, no. 422; Causa 2000, p. 184

Giovanni Battista Caracciolo (often called ‘Battistello’) was the most influential and original of Caravaggio’s followers in Naples.¹ His early training in the workshop of Belisario Corenzio gave him a solid grounding in drawing and the technique of fresco painting (both of which Caravaggio lacked). He probably travelled with Corenzio to Rome during the Jubilee year of 1600, where he first encountered the work of Caravaggio, a contact resumed when both artists were working in Naples a few years later. Caracciolo spent the rest of his career in Naples, but also worked for patrons in Rome, Genoa and Florence.

The subject of the Sleeping Cupid owed much of its popularity to a youthful sculpture by Michelangelo, a copy of a Hellenistic marble which he passed off as a genuine antiquity. Interest in this forgery, and the theme in general, arose especially in the circle of Caravaggio.² In this example the winged boy-god of love sleeps; his bow and arrows lie idle, while flowers seem to spring up around him. The idea is simple: Cupid is supremely mischievous; we are only safe when he sleeps. This joke was given an allegorical dimension in the literature and art of the period, and came to mean that tranquillity of mind can only be achieved by controlling the passions (that is, by ‘putting Cupid to sleep’).³ This idea went back to classical times, when Cupid was linked to Hypnos, the Roman god of sleep, and occasionally depicted on Roman sepulchres as an allusion to the peaceful repose of the dead.⁴

Caracciolo’s immediate source of inspiration here would seem to be Caravaggio’s version of the subject in the Pitti Palace in Florence, painted in Malta in 1608 and recorded in the collection of Francesco dell’Antella in Florence in 1609.⁵ It seems probable that Caracciolo saw Caravaggio’s painting during his Florentine sojourn in 1618.⁶ There are notable differences between the two treatments of the same subject. For example, Caracciolo’s Cupid is a slim boy with elongated limbs, while Caravaggio’s is a round baby with full cheeks. This fundamental change, as well as the idyllic landscape filled with flowers and a butterfly, gives the Royal Collection painting a more refined and elegant character.⁷

A ‘Sleeping Amor’ was mentioned in the 1627 inventory of the Gonzaga collection in Mantua, from which it was likely to have been bought by Charles I; it was sold for £15 on 30 April 1650 as a Caravaggio. Following the Restoration it was recovered for the monarchy and hung in Whitehall. Between 1676 and 1677, Nicolas de Largilliere, who worked at Windsor Castle under the direction of Antonio Verrio, is recorded as restoring the Sleeping Cupid to the satisfaction of Charles II.⁸ According to Dézallier D’Argenville in 1762, de Largilliere ‘completely repainted the legs, which had become damaged by time’.⁹ This accords with the evidence gathered from x-radiography in which damage to the legs is visible but has been expertly concealed by the work of an early restorer.¹⁰

¹ The most complete discussion of the artist and his work is found in Causa 2000.
² Moir 1976, p. 133, note 222.
³ This reading is advanced by Claudio Pizzorusso (1983, p. 55).
⁶ For Michael Levey this painting’s inspiration lay in Orazio Gentileschi’s version of the subject (illustrated in Connoisseur, June 1956, p. ii, when it was held by Sabin Galleries, London). This same connection suggested to Pierluigi Leone de Castris that no. 94 was painted in 1614, the year of Caracciolo’s meeting with Gentileschi in Rome (Leone de Castris in London 1982, p. 116). However, the attribution of the Sabin Gallery painting to Gentileschi has been doubted, notably by Alfred Moir (1976, no. 222), suggesting that it was inspired by rather than inspiring no. 94.
⁷ Other versions of this subject attributed to Caracciolo are found in the Galleria Regionale della Sicilia, Palermo, a private collection in Naples, and Whitfield Fine Art, London.
⁸ See Rosenfeld 1982, pp. 94–5.
⁹ Dézallier D’Argenville 1762, iv, p. 295: ‘surtout d’un Amour endormi placé sur une cheminée dont le jeune homme avait entièrement repeint les jambes endommagées par le temps’.
provenance
Valued by the Trustees for Sale at Somerset House, 1649, and sold to Bass and others on 19 December 1651. In the period after the Restoration of the monarchy the work returned to the Royal Collection. In 1669, at the death of Queen Henrietta Maria, ‘An Nostre Dame with a Jesus in her Arms of a Moderne hand’ is recorded as hanging in her bedchamber at Colombes.

references

As his early biographers Baldinucci and Baglione both noted, Fontebuoni was trained in the Florentine workshop of Domenico Passignano. Unfortunately, little survives of his early work in Tuscany, which appears to have been distinctly Mannerist in style. Like many Florentines of his generation, Anastasio Fontebuoni soon left Tuscany for Rome and there he was generously supported by influential patrons such as Cardinal Arrigoni and Benedetto and Vincenzo Giustiniani. He initially painted large fresco cycles such as those at Santa Balbina and Santa Prisca, but during the next two decades he worked on a great variety of works throughout the city in different media. Inspired by artists also working in Rome such as Giovanni Baglione and Carlo Saraceni, Fontebuoni absorbed the naturalism of Roman painting and combined this with the more artificial style of the Tuscan Mannerist tradition. By 1620 he had returned to Florence where he worked for Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger. Between 1621 and 1623 he received what was one of his most prestigious commissions, to paint two rooms in the Casino Mediceo di San Marco for Cardinal Carlo de’ Medici. While working in Florence for the Medici, Fontebuoni also enjoyed the patronage of the Duke of Mantua, Ferdinando Gonzaga. Fontebuoni may have met Gonzaga in Rome between 1610 and 1612 and the Duke seems to have developed a particular interest in his work. On 28 September 1621 the Mantuan agent Filippo Berardi wrote to Ferdinando...
Gonzaga to inform him that Fontebuoni had returned from Pistoia, and by October of the same year he sent news confirming that the artist was working in his service. In November of 1622, Berardi informed Gonzaga that the picture he had requested from Fontebuoni of the 'Madonna di Pistoia' was almost complete but that Fontebuoni was slow in completing the other painting he was working on for the Duke. By February of 1623, Fontebuoni had finished the 'Madonna' and Berardi promised Gonzaga he would send it shortly. It must have arrived safely in Mantua, as 'a painting of the Madonna with a baby in her arms on clouds supported by angels, a Florentine work' is recorded in the Gonzaga inventory of 18 January 1627, where it is valued at 120 lire. It was probably among the paintings bought by Charles I in the same year.

The wife of Charles I, Henrietta Maria, had a number of Italian paintings hung in her chapel in Somerset House. Some were gifts from Charles I; others she acquired through the assistance of the papal agents George Con and Gregorio Panzani. It seems highly likely that this large devotional image by Fontebuoni was among the paintings intended for the Roman Catholic Queen’s chapel, since in 1649 it was recorded by the Trustees of the Commonwealth Sale as being held in Somerset House. The painting represents the Virgin kneeling upon a cloud and surrounded by angels at her feet. She is holding the Christ Child, wrapped in red and white drapery in her arms. The strong directional gazes of the Madonna, Christ and the angel in the lower left-hand corner suggest that this work was intended for a particular location, perhaps high up on the right-hand side of an altar. Furthermore, the composition of the painting and the foreshortening of the figures seem to indicate that the work was intended to be viewed from below. Levey has suggested that the painting was cut down from a larger work, perhaps depicting the Virgin and Child appearing to a saint. For such a composition to work, the figures in this painting would have occupied the top right corner, in which case the left-hand and bottom

![Image of the painting](Fig. 120 Anastasio Fontebuoni, *The Vision of San Bernardo* (detail); oil on canvas, 270 × 150 cm (Cassa di Risparmio, Prato, Cariprato collection))
edges of this canvas would have been cut. Yet, technical examination reveals that the left edge here is unquestionably original.

However unusual, the composition of the painting is appropriate to the subject it represents: the miraculous vision of the Madonna di Pistoia who appeared to a local girl in 1336. While the girl was ill and lying in a hospital bed, the Virgin Mary came to her in a dream, holding the Christ Child in her arms. The event was subsequently painted in fresco by the Pistoian painter known as the Master of 1336. When the hospital where the vision occurred was later renovated and the church of the Madonna delle Grazie o del Letto was built to honour the miracle in the fifteenth century, the fourteenth-century fresco was removed and placed on the high altar (fig. 119). This painting has many similarities to the later seventeenth-century version of the same subject, in the curious red and white coloured swaddling clothes of the Child and the strong sense of movement created by the flowing drapery. The notional viewpoint of the young girl looking up from her bed and seeing the Madonna before her is recreated by Fontebuoni in the present painting: the diagonal composition and the strong downward gazes of the Madonna and angels engage the beholder and create the sense of a vision appearing before us. The style and technique of this work seem to confirm the attribution to Fontebuoni. The composition of the painting based on strong diagonals to represent monumental figures against a shallow background is typical of the artist’s work, as is the use of flowing drapery carefully rendered through tonal contrasts of light and dark.

In 1818 the painting was recorded at Kensington Palace and attributed to Orazio Gentileschi. When it was exhibited at the Royal Academy of Arts in 1946 it was suggested the work might be by a Spanish or Neapolitan artist. However, he revised this attribution in the second edition of his Royal Collection catalogue, published in 1991, and concluded that the artist could not be securely determined. In 1974, Fiorella Sricchia Santoro first proposed the attribution to Fontebuoni, which has been widely accepted.

1 Both Filippo Baldinucci and Giovanni Baglione included Anastasio Fontebuoni in their biographies, and his life was also later recorded by Lanzi, among others. Sricchia Santoro’s canonical article published in 1974 has been augmented by the more recent work of G. Papi (1989), A. Negro (1994), Parlato (1997, DBI, xlvii, pp. 757–60) and De Martino (2003).
2 Masetti 1962.
3 The letters are found in Luzio 1913, pp. 268–72.
4 ‘un quadro con una Madonna che ha un putino in bracio, sopra le nuole sostenute dalla angeli, opera fiorentina’; see Morselli 2000, p. 24, no. 809.
5 Millar 1972a, p. 120. See Veevers 1989.
6 Levey 1964, no. 355.
7 Although baptised in Florence, Fontebuoni may have had family ties to Pistoia. The nineteenth-century historian Tolomei claimed that he was Pistoiese on the basis of the existence of a branch of the Fontebuoni in the city in the seventeenth century. Although his specific family origins remain obscure, following his return to Tuscany in 1620 Fontebuoni spent time in Pistoia and he painted the Deposition from the Cross for the Cistercian order in the city.
8 The blue cloak worn by the Madonna was painted using blue smalt, which has discoloured, leaving its original form difficult to discern.
9 London 1946, no. 267, p. 94.
10 Levey 1962, pp. 344–71; see also Levey 1964, no. 355, p. 52.
11 Sricchia Santoro 1974, pp. 29–46. The author would like to thank Filippo Trevisani for his kind assistance with this entry.
GIOVANNI BAGLIONE
Rome c.1566–1643

96. An Allegory of Charity and Justice Reconciled 1622

Oil on canvas
255.3 x 227.0 cm
Signed and dated: AEQVES.IO.BAGLIONVS.RO.P. / 1622; tablet beside Charity inscribed: QVI / MANET / IN / CARITATE /
IN DEO / MANET / ET DEVS / IN EO; Justice holds a shield inscribed: DILIGITE / IVSTITIAM QVI / IVDICATIS / TERRAM
RCIN 407156

PROVENANCE
Recorded in the Gonzaga inventory at Mantua, 1627; purchased by Charles I with the Mantua collection; valued at £60 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to Murray and others, 23 October 1651; recovered at the Restoration

REFERENCES
Levey 1991, no. 354; Mantua 2002, no. 22

Giovanni Baglione is now best known as the author of a guidebook to Roman churches and a peculiarly unselective collection of artists’ biographies.1 In his own biography he tells us that his early training was in the workshop of the minor Florentine painter Francesco Morelli, after which he emerged as an ambitious artist gaining important commissions from some of the leading patrons of the day.2 At the height of his career he enjoyed international acclaim, and in 1606 he was knighted by Pope Paul V.

One of Giovanni Baglione’s most illustrious patrons was the Duke of Mantua, Ferdinando Gonzaga (1587–1626). In 1610 Ferdinando moved from his family seat to Rome in order to assume the title of Cardinal. Here he met Baglione; the artist’s first recorded commission from him was in 1611, shortly before Ferdinando returned to Mantua in late December 1612 following a somewhat brief sojourn in Rome. However, his relationship with Baglione continued during the following decade and, most notably, between 1621 and 1622 Baglione stayed as a guest at the Gonzaga court in Mantua. During this significant period in Baglione’s career Ferdinando and his family commissioned him to paint a number of works, including his much-praised ten-piece series entitled Apollo and the Nine Muses, later sent to Marie de’ Medici in France.3

While no documents survive, circumstantial evidence suggests that the current work, signed and dated 1622, was painted for Ferdinando Gonzaga. In a letter of 1617 to an unidentified artist, Ferdinando asked to have painted the subject of ‘Justice and Peace embracing each other’.4 It is probable that this allegory, though of the same commission. Indeed, as Lucia Marinig suggests, the letter indicates that Ferdinando had decided on the subject for the painting and probably already had in mind a location for it in the Palazzo Ducale.5 In the Gonzaga inventory of 1626–7 the painting was recorded as being held in the prestigious Galleria della Mostra in the Palazzo Ducale, where it was described as, ‘a large painting of the three virtues joined with gold chains, by the hand of the aforementioned [Baglione] estimated at 300 lire’.6

This is an allegory expressing the idea, much favoured by Renaissance political thinkers and famously expressed by Portia in the Merchant of Venice, that Justice must be tempered by Mercy, or in this case Charity (Spiritual Love), the source and origin of Mercy. Here the figures of Justice and Charity are literally chained together with a golden chain held by Divine Wisdom. To the left of Charity is a tablet which is inscribed with text, in Latin, from 1 John 4: 16 (‘he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him’), while the writing on the shield behind Justice is taken from the first verse of the Book of Wisdom (‘Love righteousness, ye that be judges of the earth’).

As is evident from his request for a painting of this theme, Ferdinando Gonzaga must have recognised the potential power of this painting to enhance his image as a magnanimous and just ruler. Furthermore, as a learned artistic patron, well versed in both religious subject matter and classical texts, he would undoubtedly have appreciated the sophisticated conceit of this work.

Recent conservation has revealed that the canvas has not been cut down, as was once thought.7 It also provided an opportunity to remove two strips (together measuring 47 cm), which had been added to the left-hand side, presumably to adapt the painting for a particular location.8

1. See Baglione 1639 and 1642.
2. For Baglione’s career see O’Neil 2002 and Macioce 2002.
3. Held in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Arras.
7. Conservation undertaken by Anna Sandén. Cusping is visible all round the original canvas, which negates Levey’s suggestion that the canvas may have been cut down.
8. Although clearly later than the original canvas, their precise date could not be determined.
ALESSANDRO TURCHI (‘L’ORBETTO’)
Verona 1578–Rome 1649

97. **Four organ shutters 1606**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. Honour (?)</th>
<th>ii. Music</th>
<th>iii. Poetry</th>
<th>iv. Virtue (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil on canvas</td>
<td>Oil on canvas</td>
<td>Oil on canvas</td>
<td>Oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.4 × 60.0 cm</td>
<td>131.2 × 60.4 cm</td>
<td>131.2 × 59.8 cm</td>
<td>131.5 × 60.2 cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provenance**

Organ shutters from the Accademia Filarmonica in Verona. In the collection of the British Consul Joseph Smith in Venice from whom purchased by George III in 1762.

**References**


Alessandro Turchi, also known as l’Orbetto, was one of the most famous artists to come from the city of Verona. Well known throughout Italy during his own lifetime, he was the only seventeenth-century Veronese painter whose critical reputation remained strong into the following century. Turchi trained in his native city in the workshop of Felice Brusasorci, where he is first recorded as working in 1597. He collaborated on works with Brusasorci and with his master’s assistance received some of his earliest commissions. In 1605, following the death of Brusasorci, Turchi helped to complete his teacher’s outstanding commission for the monumental altarpiece *The Gathering of Manna* in the church of San Giorgio in Verona. In these early works Turchi’s debt to Paolo Veronese (see no. 77), whose work had held a significant influence on the local school, is particularly evident. His painting of this period also hints at a growing interest in naturalism, inspired by Rubens, who was in Verona in 1602. Yet he also drew upon the classical tradition of the Bolognese school, in particular the style of Annibale Carracci (see nos. 88–90). This influence intensified when he moved to Rome around 1614, where he worked on commissions for religious organisations and created works for the Roman art market. He received many honours during his lifetime, including being appointed the official painter of the Accademia Filarmonica in Verona. By 1637 he had become Principal of the Accademia di San Luca in Rome, and a year later he was admitted into the Congregazione dei Virtuosi al Pantheon.

Turchi was introduced to the elite circle of Veronese intellectuals of the Accademia Filarmonica by Brusasorci. Indeed, it was the Accademia that awarded him the commission for these four paintings intended to decorate their organ. The Accademia Filarmonica had been founded in Verona in 1543 to encourage the creation and study of music. By the beginning of the seicento it had become one of the most famous music schools in Italy, including among its members some of the most distinguished individuals from the noble families of Verona. Yet it also attracted professional musicians, both local and foreign, who taught music and organised concerts for its members. A particularly fertile cultural institution, it also supported a wide variety of humanist pursuits beyond music, including philosophy, literature, archaeology and painting. Many of its members, such as Mario Bevilacqua and Federico Ceruti, were knowledgeable art collectors under whose guidance commissions were awarded to artists, with the result that a notable art collection was established.

In 1606 the Accademia decided to commission an artist to paint the shutters of its organ, the centrepiece of its newly built music hall. The construction of new premises was overseen by the Veronese architect Domenico Curtoni, and by 1605 building was well under way. The administration of the commission for the organ decoration was entrusted to Gian Giacomo Giusti and Francesco Da Sesso, who were to choose a suitable artist to ‘paint the inside and outside of the shutters and the [organ] case in the best manner and as quickly as possible’. The documents outlining the commission date from April 1606 and it is highly likely that the work was carried out shortly after that date. Although Alessandro Turchi is not named as the artist of the shutters, the circumstantial evidence supporting his involvement is strong: having succeeded Brusasorzi as official painter to the Accademia in 1609, he enjoyed the patronage of members such as Gian Giacomo Giusti, who owned a number of his paintings, and Turchi would no doubt have been the obvious choice for this prestigious commission.

The earliest attribution of the organ shutters to Turchi appears in Pellegrino Antonio Orlandi’s *Abecedario Pittorico* of 1753, where the author recalls that ‘Mr Joseph Smith, Consul of England has four beautiful figures painted in four separate paintings by the said author, which at one time adorned the organ of the Accademici Filarmonici in Verona’. In 1749 fire had destroyed the Accademia’s new theatre and subsequently much of their art collection was dispersed, including the organ shutters. It is very likely that it was at this point that the paintings entered the collection of the English Consul Joseph Smith, where they were recorded by Orlandi four years later. By 1762 Smith, an insatiable and influential art collector, had fallen into considerable financial difficulty, thus forcing him to sell his large collection to King George III. The list of works bought by the English monarch includes the four paintings by Turchi and identifies them as *Valour, Music, Poetry and Fortitude*.

The figures were inspired by Cesare Ripa’s *Iconologia* and the artist probably consulted the 1603 edition, which included a number of woodcut illustrations. Identifiable primarily by their costume and the attributes they hold, the allegorical figures can be grouped in pairs. When the shutters were closed *Honour (?)* appeared on the left with *Virtue (?)* on the right; when opened, *Music* appeared on the left with *Poetry* on the right. In 2004, during the most recent restoration of the shutters, the original location of the hinges was revealed and this configuration confirmed. Turchi created the illusion that they are standing in shallow spaces, like statues in niches. The outer figures share a continuous space so that the two shutters form one golden niche when closed. All four figures appear to move outside their painted spaces into our space with their attributes. They are all
lit dramatically from upper left, the figure of Virtue (?) dynamically highlighted as she turns to face Honour (?). Poetry moves with energy towards Music. The shape of the niches and the lighting of the inner two, Music and Poetry, seem to take account of the angle, like the wings of a triptych, of organ shutters when open. Turchi did not follow Ripa precisely when devising his figures, so that only the identity of Music is undisputed. The male figure of Honour (?) is dressed in Roman costume and wears a laurel wreath upon his head, a golden chain with what seem to be two crossed palms around his neck, and he holds a shield and spear. In Ripa Honour has the attributes of a spear, a garland of laurel, a golden necklace and a shield. The female winged figure of Virtue clutches a laurel crown and a spear in her right hand, as described by Ripa, who adds a sun at her breast. The woodcut illustration is close to our figure, which suggests that where there was no illustration Turchi and his patrons followed Ripa less precisely.

Music plays a lyre, while at her feet are an anvil and hammer, referring to the story that Pythagoras was inspired by the sounds of the forge to invent a system of musical notation. Crowned with a laurel wreath, Poetry is dressed in blue to show that poetry is a heavenly art; her head is winged, to convey her ‘flights of Fancy’; she holds a book in one hand and, in the other, a laurel branch, sharpened like a quill pen. Ripa includes the laurel crown, wings on head, book in left hand and ‘sceptre’ of laurel, but there is no woodcut illustration.

The figures recall classically inspired models of the sixteenth century, notably the work of Raphael and his followers, as well as the monumental allegorical painting of Veronese, such as his frescoes at the Villa Barbaro in Maser. The artist combines the monumental sculptural quality of the illusionistic statues in the niches with the naturalism of real figures who, inspired by the heavens, turn and move dynamically into our space. 

1 For the artist’s life and work see Scaglietti Kelescian in Verona 1999. See also Magagnato in Verona 1974, pp. 301–10.
3 Scaglietti Kelescian in Verona 1999, p. 80: ‘dipingere dentro e fuori le portelle e la casa di esso nel miglior modo e prestezza che parez’.
5 Italian List, no. 236–9 (‘these 4 were the doors of the Organ in the Salon of the Accademici Filarmonica at Verona’).
6 First published in 1593 and with accompanying woodcut illustrations in 1603, this influential source would have been well known to the artist and his patrons.

7 Honour (?) was conserved in 1992–3 by Graeme Barraclough, the other three in 2004 by Simon Folkes.
8 Michael Levey questioned the identification of the figures of Poetry and Virtue, proposing instead that they represent History and Victory (with wings and crown of laurel).
9 Ripa 1603, pp. 262–263.
10 Ripa (1603, pp. 510–11) describes Virtue as ‘Una giovane bella, & graziosa, con l’ali alle spalle, nella destra mano tenghi un’hasta, & con la sinistra una corona di lauro, e nel petto habbia un sole’.
No. 97.1, iv: organ shutters closed
No. 97.ii, iii: organ shutters open
provenance
Possibly acquired by Charles I with the Mantuan collection in 1628–29. Seen by Monconys (Journal des voyages de Monsieur De Monconys) on 20 May 1663 in the Duchess of York’s apartments at St James’s Palace.

references

Domenichino joined Denis Calvaert’s studio as a boy in Bologna, before transferring to the Carracci academy (see no. 88). In 1602 he moved to Rome, where he collaborated with Annibale Carracci (nos. 88–90, 113–14) on a number of decorative schemes, including the final phases of the Galleria Farnese. This experience positioned Domenichino as the heir of Annibale and the leading classicist of his generation, as demonstrated by his frescoes in San Luigi dei Francesi (completed 1615). After a period of four years in Bologna and Fano, Domenichino returned to Rome on the election of the Bolognese Gregory XV in 1621, and soon after he was commissioned to paint the choir of Sant’Andrea della Valle, his greatest fresco cycle in Rome (see no. 117).

In 1631 Domenichino travelled to Naples to fresco scenes from the life of San Gennaro in the cathedral, in the face of violent hostility from local artists; his death was believed by some to have been due to poisoning.

His early period in Rome coincided with a significant discovery in the city. In 1605, during the course of the remodelling of the Roman basilica of Sant’Agnes Fuori le Mura under Cardinal Sfondrato, the remains of the fourth-century martyr St Agnes were discovered. Agnes had been condemned to death by the Roman Emperor for her unwavering adherence to the Christian faith; despite her tormentors’ initial attempts to kill her, she miraculously remained unharmed until she was finally beheaded. The present painting fits within the climate of renewed interest in the cult of St Agnes, the virgin martyr, which flourished in Rome at this time, encouraged by Cardinal Sfondrato and Pope Paul V.

Domenichino represents the saint standing and gazing heavenward as an angel holding a palm and a crown floats above her. Pentiments are clearly visible in the head and the hands of the saint where the artist made slight changes to their position. On the left-hand side the large classical vase and low-relief sculpture signify the pagan beliefs rejected by the saint; in contrast, a small putto in the foreground embraces a lamb, her attribute (from the Latin, agnus) and a symbol of innocence and purity.

Evidence for the carefully modelled quality of the putto and the lamb is found in a preparatory chalk drawing for the painting held in Windsor Castle (fig. 121). The other side of this sheet contains a study for another Domenichino altarpiece, similar in style: the Madonna del Rosario (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna), completed in Rome in the early 1620s. Since Domenichino does not seem to have worked on the same sheets at different periods in his career, scholars have generally accepted the existence of preparatory drawings for both the St Agnes and the Madonna del Rosario on a single sheet as persuasive evidence supporting a dating of the two works to the same period. The significance of St Agnes in Rome may indicate a dating of the work to the period immediately following the artist’s return to the papal city in 1621. A characteristically vibrant and rich colour palette, fluid drapery, and carefully studied figural types, unify the artist’s work of this period; the work holds stylistic affinities to paintings such as the altarpiece of the Martyrdom of St Agnes (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna).

Domenichino’s debt to earlier painters is particularly evident in the figure of St Agnes, which recalls the central figure in Raphael’s painted altarpiece of St Cecilia with Four Saints (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna). Painted for the Bolognese church of San Giovanni in Monte, this was studied by the Carracci and their followers and would have been well known to Domenichino. Notably, Domenichino also draws upon the art of Titian: the figure of the angel holding the crown and palm shows the influence of the Venetian artist’s Worship of Venus of 1518 (Prado). This painting and its companion, The Bacchanal (c.1518; Prado), were in the possession of the Aldobrandini family; a now lost study by Domenichino of The Bacchanal attests to the artist’s intimate knowledge of this significant Roman collection.

1 Useful examinations of Domenichino’s oeuvre are found in Richard Spear’s two-volume monograph (Spear 1982) and the catalogue of the 1996 exhibition at the Palazzo Venezia in Rome dedicated to the artist (Rome 1996).
2 For the seventeenth-century history of the church see Frutaz 1992.
5 Levey 1964, pp. 76–7. Borea proposed an earlier dating of 1615, but most recently Spear has argued in support of the traditionally recognised dating c.1620. See Borea 1965, p. 169, note 40; Rome 1996, p. 438, note 33.
6 Richard Spear (1982, pp. 218–19) also links the figure of St Agnes to the artist’s Mary Magdalene in Glory (Hermitage) of the same period.
7 The drawing is noted in the 1664 inventory of Francesco Raspantini; see Spear 1982, p. 219.
GUIDO RENI
Bologna 1575–1642

99. Cleopatra with the Asp c.1628

Oil on canvas
114.2 x 95.0 cm
rcin 405338

PROVENANCE
Vertue recorded the picture as part of the collection of Frederick, Prince of Wales, at Leicester House in 1749. George III later included it in a display of mainly seicento pictures in the King’s Closet at Buckingham Palace.

REFERENCE
Levey 1991, no. 576

Described poetically by his seventeenth-century contemporary Pier Francesco Minozzi as the ‘Plato of the mute poets, the Virgil of the draughtsmen, and the Aristotle of the painters’, Guido Reni received some of the highest praise awarded to artists working in Baroque Italy.1 Like Domenichino (nos. 98, 116–17), Reni trained first with Denis Calvaert and then (between 1594–5 and 1598) in the workshop of Ludovico Carracci. In 1601 he moved to Rome, where he benefited from the patronage of the Borghese family and adopted an increasingly Caravaggesque manner; nonetheless, he maintained close links with Bologna, travelling back there frequently and employing many assistants from the Carracci circle, such as Giovanni Lanfranco (no. 132). Reni was a difficult character, frequently in dispute with his patrons, and in 1614 he returned permanently to Bologna. The following years saw perhaps his greatest works, marked by robustly classical compositions and firm colouring. He was increasingly sought after by powerful patrons beyond the city (and beyond Italy), but some of the few projects for which he was lured to leave Bologna ended in failure. In his later years Reni’s paintings became more delicate and lost something of their vigour, but he remained one of the most innovative painters in Italy.

This painting was executed following the artist’s return to Bologna and can be dated to the latter part of the 1620s. According to Reni’s biographer Carlo Cesare Malvasia, the painting was commissioned by a Venetian merchant called Boselli at the instigation of Reni’s friend and colleague Palma Giovane (see no. 78).2 Giovane wrote to persuade Reni to create a painting of Cleopatra for Boselli, so that it could be judged in competition with his own works and those of Niccolò Renieri and Guercino. Malvasia recounts that while Reni’s painting of Cleopatra did not win the contest, nevertheless after Boselli’s death it was bought by Renieri. A description of Renieri’s large art collection of 1666 mentions a painting of a half-length figure of Cleopatra seated with a small table in the background, with very similar measurements to the Royal Collection picture. In 1675, this painting appears listed amongst those sold by Renieri to Domenico Fontana.3

Palma Giovane died in 1628, which provides a terminus post quem for the execution of the work. Indeed, the evidence for such a dating is further supported by the stylistic qualities of the work. The painting is typical of Reni’s style of the late 1620s and early 1630s, which relied upon firm brushwork and an enamel-like finish to the paint surface.

The subject of the painting is the final moments in the life of the Egyptian Queen, Cleopatra, as she prepares to commit suicide, as recounted by Plutarch in his Lives of the Caesars. Guido Reni has chosen to represent the moment when the asp (which has been smuggled in to Cleopatra in the basket of figs depicted in the background) is about to deliver the lethal bite into her bare breast. Reni heightened the dramatic potency of the image through the stark contrast between the fair skin of Cleopatra and the dark background of the painting. Her form is carefully modelled and she is enveloped in swirls of convincingly rendered pink drapery. The naturalism of her expression and the lifelike quality of her flesh are depicted through Reni’s conscientious draughtsmanship and his expert use of colour and tonal variations to build form. His particular attention to detail can be seen in the gold edging on the rose-coloured drapery and the reflection of light captured in Cleopatra’s pearl earring.

Reni often re-worked successful compositions; he returned frequently to the subject of Cleopatra over the course of his career and made many variants of this painting.4 Versions are found in the Museo Capitolino, Rome, the Prado, Madrid, and the Pitti Palace, Florence.

The Royal Collection painting is of exceptional quality and one of the finest depictions of this subject in Reni’s oeuvre.5

1 This quote is repeated by Malvasia in his biography of the artist (Malvasia 1980 edn, p. 141). For studies of the artist and his oeuvre see Pepper 1984; Bologna 1988.
2 Malvasia 1980 edn, p. 129.
3 Procacci 1965, p. 94, doc. xv, pp. 97–8, doc. xxiv.
4 This aspect of Reni’s working method is discussed in Pepper 1999, pp. 27–54.

The Royal Collection is grateful to the Trustees of the National Galleries of Scotland for lending this work.
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Domenico Fetti
Rome 1588–Venice 1623

100. David with the Head of Goliath c.1620

Oil on canvas
153.0 × 125.1 cm
RCIN 404731

Provenance
Probably part of the Mantuan sale to Charles I; valued at £20 by the Trustees for Sale in October 1649 and sold to Houghton and others on 16 January 1652; recovered at the Restoration

References
Levey 1991, no. 469; Safarik 1990, pp. 46–7

Born in Rome in 1588, Domenico Fetti was trained by his father Pietro and later went on to study with Andrea Commodi and Ludovico Cigoli. It was in his native city that he made the acquaintance of Ferdinando Gonzaga, then a Cardinal, who would later become one of his most important patrons. By January 1613 Gonzaga had returned to his home territory of Mantua to take up the title of Duke and, in the following year, invited Fetti to work at his court. Surrounded by the riches of the Gonzaga collection, Fetti quickly developed an innovative style inspired by the chiaroscuro of Caravaggio (see nos. 91–2), the painterly handling of Rubens, his predecessor as Mantuan court artist, and the atmospheric drama of the great Venetians Veronese and Tintoretto (see nos. 75–7), who became especially important to him after his visit to Venice in 1621. Fetti was given many of the most prized commissions at the Mantuan court, both for large-scale decorative cycles and as a portrait painter; in around 1620 he began a monumental series of portraits of the Gonzaga family for the Galleria della Mostra in the Palazzo Ducale. All three paintings by Fetti included here (nos. 100–102) date from this period (c.1620–1622), when he was at the height of his career. In 1622, following a violent quarrel with the artist Gabriele Balestrieri, Fetti was forced to leave Mantua and he took up residence in Venice.

This painting depicts the Old Testament story of the shepherd boy David who triumphed over the giant Goliath (1 Samuel 17: 41–51). Using a single stone from his sling, David killed Goliath, and then decapitated him. Here, at the conclusion of the drama, David leans against the head of the giant, grasping his hair in his left hand while in his right he holds Goliath’s huge sword. In the background the headless corpse of the giant lies upon the battlefield as the Philistines are being overcome by the Israelites.

Fetti painted a number of different versions of this subject, which were widely copied by his workshop and later followers. Versions by Fetti are found in the Akademie der Bildenden, Nuremberg, the Pushkin National Museum, Moscow and the Gallerie dell’Accademia in Venice. However, the composition of these paintings varies considerably and the most notable work with particular similarities to the Royal Collection version is his David with the Head of Goliath in the Gemäldegalerie, Dresden (fig. 122).1

Fetti painted this work while employed at the court in Mantua. It is typical of the artist’s mature style using dramatic compositions executed in a painterly manner. Fetti employed canvases primed in dark tones and he typically applied paint quickly using short, rapid brush-strokes to build up a vivid contrast between light and shadow. While Eduard A. Safarik has proposed the possibility that this painting may have been a workshop copy, this seems highly unlikely. The handling of the paint is spontaneous and applied in a self-assured manner. The existence of numerous pentiments also suggests that the artist was still working out aspects of the composition while painting. Unlike the Dresden version and a preparatory drawing for the subject (J. Paul Getty Museum; fig. 123), Fetti changes the position of David’s right hand to grasp the sword of Goliath in a more active manner.

In the 1627 inventory of the Gonzaga collection in Mantua there are two descriptions of paintings of ‘David with the Head of Goliath’, which are possibly identifiable with the Royal Collection painting by Fetti, although neither is attributed to a particular artist. One, valued at 24 lire, was in the long corridor between Santa Barbara and the Castello; the other, valued at 90 lire, was

Fig. 122 Domenico Fetti, David with the Head of Goliath; oil on canvas, 160 × 112 cm (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden)

Fig. 123 Domenico Fetti, David with the Head of Goliath; red, black and white chalk, 28.9 × 20.3 cm (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles)
in the Galleria Piccola. It is likely that both Mantuan paintings were acquired by Charles I. In 1649 the records of the Commonwealth Sale mention a ‘David w.th goliagh. Head by fette’, valued at £20. This painting was later sold on 16 January 1652 to Robert Houghton. In 1650 the inventory of the collection of Charles I at Somerset House mentions a ‘David with the Head of Goliath’, which is probably the other Fetti painting of the subject recorded at Mantua and now lost. Following the Restoration, a version of the subject attributed to Fetti again entered the Royal Collection and was hung in Whitehall. It is likely that the canvas was enlarged during the time of William III when the frame was built and the additions, which can be noted on all the edges of the canvas, were probably made at this point. Subsequently, during the reign of Queen Anne, the painting hung over a door in the Drawing Room at Hampton Court.

1 The author would like to thank Dr Andreas Henning for his kind assistance with her research.
2 Cosnac 1884, p. 416; Safarik 1990, p. 43.
DOMENICO FETTI  
Rome 1588–Venice 1623  

101. **Portrait of Vincenzo Avogadro 1620**

Oil on canvas  
115.4 × 90.3 cm  
Inscribed: **VINC. AVOG. REC. ECCL. S.S. GER. ET/ PROT. MANT. ANNO N. D. CX ( )/ AETA. SVE. ANN XXXV.**  
RCIN 405527

**Provenance**
Bought with the collection of Consul Smith by George III, 1762; hung at Buckingham House

**References**
Levey 1991, no. 470; Safarik 1990, no. 128

The inscription in the lower right-hand corner, placed along the arm of the chair, identifies the sitter here as Vincenzo Avogadro, Rector of the church of Santi Gervasio e Protasio in Mantua, and gives his age as 35. The registry of deaths in the State Archive in Mantua records one Vincenzo Avogadro as having died in 1630 at the age of 45 years.1 Assuming that this is the same man, this portrait must have been painted in 1620. The style of the painting, which accords with Fetti’s mature technique, seems to confirm this date. However, the date of the painting in the same inscription appears to read **N. D. CX** (presumably meaning **MDCX** or 1610). There is dark repaint in the area of the date, thus the most likely explanation is that a final **X** of the date remains hidden from view.

Avogadro stands in three-quarter view in front of a chair and looks out at the viewer over his left shoulder. In his hands he holds a book, and in the upper left-hand corner of the painting is a crucifix. The interior of the room in which he stands, presumably the sacristy of the church, is simply decorated, yet the luxurious fabric of the altar cloth and his richly coloured costume hint at his noble standing. A most obvious comparison can be made between this work and the Francesco Andreini (Hermitage; fig. 124), which sits comfortably within Fetti’s oeuvre and has particular similarities to the Royal Collection portrait. Like Francesco Andreini, Vincenzo Avogadro engages the viewer with his gaze, lending a psychological dimension to the portrait and a melancholy quality to the painting.

In the catalogue of the Royal Academy exhibition in 1946, the correct attribution to Fetti was first proposed.2 Long accepted by scholars, this has been challenged by Lehmann, who suggests Daniel van den Dijck as the artist, and Eduard A. Safarik, who raises the possibility that it could be the work of a copyist.3 Safarik cites the missing letter in the date as evidence that the copyist may have had difficulty reading the original and thus left it out. Furthermore, he characterises the painting materials as extremely poor and the finish not of the artist’s usual standard. While the inscription does not seem to have been particularly carefully executed, the technique of the work and the materials used accord well with Fetti’s mature style. As found with many paintings of this period, some of the colours have faded noticeably. The blue smalt pigment which Fetti used for the robe of his sitter has darkened dramatically and the nuances of tonal variations in the drapery are no longer as visible as they would once have been. The red pigment used for the collar and the buttons of the sitter’s costume have not faded in the same manner, and give an indication of the much fresher original quality the work would have had. The altar cloth in the lower right-hand corner is painted using broad brushstrokes enhanced with short, spontaneous highlights in a manner well used by Fetti in other works (e.g. no. 102). It cannot be disputed that the face of the sitter in the present work is particularly accomplished, painted in a self-assured and confident manner typical of Fetti’s mature style. Emerging from the darkness behind him, this powerful and mysterious portrait provides an intriguing character study of the Mantuan rector. A1

---

1 Perina 1965, pp. 458–9, fig. 300.  
2 London 1946, p. 91, no. 112.  
DOMENICO FETTI
Rome 1588–Venice 1623

102. *The Sacrifice of Elijah before the Priests of Baal* c.1621–2

Oil on canvas
68.4 × 82.3 cm (frame) × 70.5 cm (support)
RCIN 405466

PROVENANCE
Mentioned in the Gonzaga inventory of 1627, note 634: ‘Three paintings by the hand of Fetti . . . in the third the sacrifice of Nouè . . . ’; valued at £3 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to Turbridge on 30 April 1650; recovered at the Restoration

REFERENCES
Levey 1991, no. 471; Safarik 1990, no. 10

This painting dates to the later period of Fetti’s career and was probably executed about the time of his move to Venice in 1622. The work was quickly painted, giving the subject a dynamic quality. As is typical of his last paintings in Venice, such as the *Flight into Egypt* (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and the *San Simeone* (private collection, New York), here Fetti used subtle tonal variations to build up the forms, contrasted with a dramatic use of chiaroscuro. The small scale of the work and its rapid execution led Nicholas Ivanoff to conclude that it was a *bozzetto* or preparatory study for a larger painting, though no such painting survives and there are no other examples of oil sketches in Fetti’s oeuvre.¹

Based on 1 Kings 18: 38, the painting depicts the sacrifice by Elijah to Jehovah. Elijah kneels in the lower right corner of the painting and looks up at the fire of the Lord that descends upon his sacrificial offering. Opposite him, on the left, those who had been encouraged in the worship of Baal, a false god, recoil in horror as they realise the error of their ways. This rarely depicted Old Testament scene was captured in a woodcut contained in an illustrated bible of 1573 published in Lyons, and it is from this source that Fetti seems to have taken inspiration (fig. 125). Fetti reverses aspects of the woodcut, such as the kneeling figure of Elijah and he eliminates much of the detail in the background, thus tightening the composition.²

Furthermore, the composition of the upper left-hand portion of the painting demonstrates many similarities with an engraving by Orazio Borgianni of 1615, based on Raphael’s fresco of Joseph and his brothers in the Vatican Loggie.³ Homan Potterman has suggested that Fetti may have studied an engraving by Maerten van Heemskerck.⁴

The painting is described as a ‘sacrifice of Noah’ in the 1627 inventory in the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua. It was acquired by Charles I and was part of the inventory of the Commonwealth Sale in 1649, where it was valued at £3. Subsequently it was sold in 1650 to Robert Turbridge and was later recovered during the Restoration. Although it is clearly attributed to Fetti in the earliest records, during the nineteenth century the artist of the painting was believed to be Aert de Gelder. In 1929, the work was first reattributed by Roberto Longhi and given to Fetti. Only Lehmann has questioned this attribution, considering it the work of an imitator.⁵ Painted in Fetti’s characteristic technique using quickly applied brushstrokes of colour over more broadly painted areas to create a luminous and shimmering quality, this remarkable painting is patently autograph.

1 Ivanoff 1963, pp. 38–41, note 619; for the arguments against this being an oil sketch see Askew 1976, pp. 14–23.
2 Pamela Askew first pointed out this comparison.
3 Bartsch xviii, p. 318, no. 25; Safarik 1990, p. 50.
4 Potterton 1979, no. 9, pp. 64–5.

---

Fig. 125 *The Sacrifice of Elijah*; woodcut (Biblioteca Comunale, Mantua)
Bernardo Strozzi
Genoa c.1581 – Venice 1644

103. The Concert c.1635

Oil on canvas
101.2 × 112.0 cm
RCIN 404978

Provenance
Acquired by George III with the collection of Consul Smith, 1762
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Genoese painting of the seventeenth century owes much to the inventive and eclectic manner of Bernardo Strozzi.1 Having risen from humble family origins, by the height of his career Strozzi had achieved great fame not only in his native city, but also in his adopted home of Venice. Strozzi was trained in the Tuscan Mannerist style and his early works painted in the 1590s and the first decade of the seventeenth century demonstrate his debt to painters such as Ventura Salimbeni and Aurelio Lomi. Nonetheless, by the 1620s Strozzi had discovered the work of Caravaggio and his style moved towards a more lively naturalism. It was also during this early period of his career in Genoa that Strozzi became aware of the art of Rubens, borrowing his vibrant colours and robust forms. Yet the most profound changes in Strozzi’s style occurred at the end of the 1620s when he began to engage with the art of Venetian painters whose work he would have encountered in Genoese private collections. Around 1631 he moved to Venice and adopted the warm atmospheric quality and luminous palettes of Veronese and Titian.

The Concert dates from these Venetian years and demonstrates his characteristically daring use of colour and thick, heavy impasto applied in a confident and clearly articulated manner. His style of painting lends this work a sense of energy and vitality particularly suited to the representation of two musicians. Strozzi painted numerous works depicting musicians, both solo such as in The Piper, or in a group as in The Three Musicians.2 The present composition is one of his best known and occurs in many versions, of which this is a fine and clearly autograph example.3

Although traditionally entitled The Concert, the work actually represents two musicians tuning up as they prepare to begin playing together. A clean-shaven young violinist, dressed in a simple costume, is accompanied by an older lute-player, in boldly coloured green and yellow attire and a large plumed hat. Both figures direct their gazes outwards, as if focusing their attention on someone beyond the picture plane. The tenor shawm placed in the left foreground suggests that this person may be a third player. The accurate depiction of the musical instruments and the precise positioning of the musicians’ hands demonstrate Strozzi’s careful study and understanding of these elements.

Further evidence of Strozzi’s particular working method is supplied by the preparatory drawings that have been linked to this work. A Study of head of a child and of hands of a lute player (Palazzo Rosso, Genoa; fig. 126) was first connected with this painting by Homan Potterton in 1979: on this sheet Strozzi drew four studies for hands that are closely related to the hands of the musicians here. The preparatory drawings show Strozzi working out possible positions for the left hand of the younger musician and for the lute-player’s hands as he tunes his instrument. Further associations have been made between the figure of the older musician and two preparatory drawings of male figures by Strozzi in the Louvre and the National Gallery of Scotland.4 In the present work, Strozzi has reworked the composition in certain areas and pentiments are visible around the neck and body of the lute. AL

1 Luisa Mortari’s monograph on the artist first published in 1966 and revised in 1995 remains the most complete study of Strozzi’s oeuvre (see Mortari 1995). See also Genoa 1995.
2 Musical instruments are secondary elements in paintings such as The Allegory of Fame in the National Gallery, London, in which the female figure holds a tenor shawm with similarities to the one in The Concert.
3 Eighteen are listed in Mortari 1995, nos. 399–416, pp. 170–73.

Fig. 126 Bernardo Strozzi, Study of head of a child and of hands of a lute player; black chalk, 25.4 × 40.0 cm (Palazzo Rosso, Gabinetto dei Disegni e Stampe, Genoa)
Orazio Gentileschi
Pisa 1563–London 1639

104. A Sibyl c.1635–8

Oil on canvas
59.9 × 68.7 cm
RCIN 405660

Provenance
Presumably painted for Charles I, and perhaps the picture valued at £6 at Hampton Court in October 1649 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to Houghton on 16 January 1652; recovered at the Restoration
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Orazio Gentileschi was the son of a Florentine goldsmith, Giovanni Battista di Bartolomeo Lomi. He moved to Rome in c.1576–8 and was profoundly affected by Caravaggio’s intense observation from life, dramatic use of light and arrangement of figures close to the picture plane. The artists knew each other well – indeed, both were sued for libel by Giovanni Baglione (see no. 96) in 1603. In 1624 Gentileschi was in Paris working for Marie de’ Medici and from there he was invited to London by the Duke of Buckingham, the favourite of Charles I. Always difficult and arrogant, Gentileschi was in his sixties and did not adapt well to his new country. His quarrel with Balthasar Gerbier, Buckingham’s trusted adviser on artistic matters and keeper of his collection, ended with Gerbier imprisoning Gentileschi’s sons for debt and for being involved in a public brawl. Gentileschi joined the household of the Duke of Buckingham, for whom he painted several pictures, and remained in his lodgings at York House on the Strand even after the Duke’s assassination in 1628. The Duchess of Buckingham was complaining of his presence in 1631, when she wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton, Viscount Dorchester: ‘My Lo: I understand by Jentlesco that if hee could have the money dewe to him from his Ma hee would willinglie leave England and begone into his owne Cuntrie, and I believe the King hath noe greate use of him.’

His commissions from Henrietta Maria, who was half Florentine and a fellow Catholic, were his chief reason for staying. As he was in effect painter to the Queen, his focus of interest was first her court at Somerset House and then the Queen’s House in Greenwich, designed by Inigo Jones (see p. 27 above).

Gentileschi died in London in 1639 and was given the exceptional privilege of being buried under the main altar in Henrietta Maria’s Catholic Chapel in Somerset House.

The twelve sibyls were the seers of classical antiquity alleged to have foretold the coming of Christ, and were thus adopted by the Church as pagan equivalents of the Old Testament prophets. Michelangelo alternated prophets and sibyls on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, a prototype which may explain the great popularity of the subject over the next two hundred years. Like Guercino’s interpretation (no. 108), Gentileschi’s recalls well-known earlier examples by Guido Reni and Domenichino. His sibyl wears a turban, holds a tablet inscribed with indecipherable hieroglyphs and looks upwards with a dreamy, thoughtful gaze, as if seeking divine inspiration. The painting does not seem to have been part of a set, and although the subject has been thought to be the Persian Sibyl, there is no specific attribute by which to recognise her.

Sterling dated the painting to the beginning of Gentileschi’s English period by comparison with his Public Felicity (Louvre) of c.1624–6.

Although Gentileschi’s refined style did not alter very much at this date, the sibyl’s features are also close to those of Victory in the central roundel of Orazio’s ceiling for the Queen’s House, Greenwich, of c.1636–8 (now Marlborough House, London; fig. 127). The sibyl’s pensive mood and the rich and soft modulation of light from deep shadow to bright highlights on eyes, nose and lips can be related to many of the figures on the Greenwich ceiling. The more private small-scale painting might have been developed at the same time as the Greenwich ceiling figures, and with an awareness of the popularity in the 1630s of half-length female figures painted by other Italians, particularly Guido Reni.

1 Onorio Longhi, Orazio Gentileschi and Caravaggio were alleged to have written verses calling Baglione ‘the disgrace of painting’; Friedlaender (1955, pp. 271–9) published the documents of the case.


3 There are two accounts of his high standing when he first arrived: the diary of Maréchal de Bassompierre, the French Ambassador Extraordinary, and a letter from Amerigo Salveti, Tuscan envoy from London, 4 December 1625 (London 1999, p. 10; Finaldi and Wood in New York 2001, pp. 223–4).


9 The painting must have been in one of the palaces not recorded in Van der Doort (Millar 1960). A cr brand on the back was recorded on the 1862 Redgrave sheet, subsequently covered by relining.

ORAZIO GENTILESCHI
Pisa 1563 – London 1639

105. Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife c.1630–32

Oil on canvas
206.0 × 261.9 cm
Signed on the back of the original canvas: HORATIVS – GENTILESCV/ FECIT
RCIN 405477

PROVENANCE
Presumably painted for Charles I; valued at £50 by the Trustees for Sale and sold to George Wilson; recovered at the Restoration

REFERENCES
Levey 1991, no. 501; Bissell 1981, no. 64; London 1999, no. 10

The Book of Genesis (39: 7–20) tells how Joseph was bought by Potiphar, the Egyptian captain of Pharaoh’s guard, who appointed him overseer of his household. Potiphar’s wife attempted to seduce him on several occasions, although he rejected her advances. One day, ‘she caught him by his garment, saying, “Lie with me.” But he left his garment in her hand, and fled and got out of the house’. Later she denounced Joseph as the seducer, using the garment as evidence.

The painting is not mentioned by Sandrart, writing in 1629; it is first recorded at Greenwich when a frame was prepared for it in 1633–4.1 Gentileschi’s last recorded payment was for £400 under a Privy Seal warrant of 14 June 1632, paid on 27 July, and it is likely that part of this payment was for the present painting.2 Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife was one of a group of paintings by Gentileschi brought together for Henrietta Maria in the Italianate Queen’s House at Greenwich, designed by Inigo Jones. It may have been brought to Greenwich in 1633–4, but was probably only hung in the Queen’s House after 1637, when work was still being carried out on the interiors and where it remained until the Commonwealth Sale.3 The painting was possibly hung upstairs in the Queen’s Antechamber or the north-west Cabinet Room in the Queen’s House.4 The unusual perspective of the scene – it is best viewed from close to, near the left-hand edge – suggests that Gentileschi may have had a specific hanging position in mind, even if it was several years before it could be installed in the Queen’s House.

This painting may have been cleaned and restored between the two visits of G.F. Waagen to Hampton Court in 1837 and 1854, since in his first account he praises the strong colouring and the striking effect, but in the second he laments the effects of over-cleaning.3 More recent analysis of the picture, during its conservation in 1978, revealed that the canvas was prepared with a glue layer followed by two layers of priming, a red layer and a grey-white.6 This was the practice recommended by Théodore Turquet de Mayerne in his Pictoria Sculptoria of 1620.7 The composition was built up methodically, with the floor tiles painted before the figures, the bed before the untucked sheets and Potiphar’s wife.8 De Mayerne also recorded that Gentileschi added to his palette a drop of Venetian amber varnish (of the kind used for lutes) to give his flesh areas a translucent and lustrous effect. Although the final appearance of the painting is characteristically meticulous, the main areas were blocked in freely before the figures were added.

Gentileschi’s practice seems to have been to work directly on to the canvas without drawings, as Caravaggio had done. Analysis from cross-sections and x-rays has revealed that the position of the two protagonists did not alter significantly once painting had begun, but some other changes were made: the perspective of the painting was altered by lowering the far side of the bed; the curtain was raised on the left and the pillow lowered; the right arm of Potiphar’s wife and Joseph’s legs were slightly moved, and her further breast, at first demurely covered, was revealed.9 Paint analysis reveals an early use of bitumen, a substance more usually associated with eighteenth- and nineteenth-century paintings, for the browns in the green bed-cover, the black background and the braid decorating the edges of Joseph’s tunic.

The smooth surfaces and meticulous rendering of sumptuous fabrics remind us that Gentileschi trained in Florence with its strong tradition of draughtsmanship, and at a time when Bronzino’s style (no. 7) was still popular. This late Mannerist style was deeply influenced by the young Caravaggio in Rome. It was characteristic of Gentileschi to repeat compositions with small alterations and to reuse particular poses. The figure of Joseph appears in a previous Gentileschi composition, yet it was probably
also studied from life. We know that Gentileschi continued to employ male and female models in his English period: both elegant figures have a weighty presence and vivid reality, which suggests that he has used them here.

To explain the light in the scene we must imagine a single, powerful lamp placed just in front of the painting at its right edge: Joseph’s legs cast their shadow backwards; the bed legs cast theirs across to the left. This strong, dramatic and literal-minded lighting recalls Caravaggio as it accentuates the cool flesh of Potiphar’s wife and her beautifully white, though dishevelled, sheets, and tellingly catches Joseph’s backward glance. The actors in the scene wear contemporary clothes, but this element of realism is transformed by the virtuoso rendering of fabrics in highly saturated colours, so characteristic of Gentileschi’s late style.

The studied finish and theatrical elegance of this painting are characteristic of the taste of Charles I’s court, for which elaborate and artificial masques were created. This refinement was also part of an international court style which had developed from Caravaggio and which can also be seen in the smooth finish and rich colours of Gerrit van Honthorst and Simon Vouet. Gentileschi is sometimes criticised for choosing visual pleasure rather than psychological intensity. This painting has both: the colours clash, particularly the red, burgundy, orange and gold; the rich hangings suggest conspiracy as well as sensuality. The dominant effect of the painting is claustrophobia: an illusionistic curtain (which seems almost to be covering the surface of the painting) closes off a shallow space; even the implied positions of the viewer and the light source are thrust up against this scene of dangerous seduction.

2 Bissell 1981, pp. 106, 191; Wood 2000–2001, p. 122, n. 102. Sainsbury (1859, p. 316) and Levey (1991) thought it possible that the painting was amongst an earlier delivery of pictures to the King for which Gentileschi was paid £200 by a warrant of 24 June 1631.
5 Massing (A.) 1988, p. 100: ‘This picture which was originally of warm and harmonious colouring and striking effect, has unfortunately, by overcleaning acquired a motley and hard appearance.’ Waagen 1838, ii, pp. 119–20; 1854, ii, p. 359.
6 The findings of this examination were published in Massing (A.) 1988, pp. 89–104. The painting had been reduced slightly on all sides, probably to fit a frame, and the canvas size was restored to its previous dimensions in 1978.
8 Evidence from analysis of cross-sections of paint samples shows that the bed leg, for example, runs over the grey-beige of the floor, and the meeting of the floor and background can be seen underneath Joseph’s white hose because of the greater transparency of the oil in the paint.
9 For a full discussion see Massing (A.) 1988.
10 The lost Apollo and the Nine Muses; the figure was copied by Rubens for Prosperity in Peace and War, and for Diana the Huntress, c.1630 (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Nantes).
**ARTEMISIA GENTILESCHI**

Rome 1593 – Naples 1652/3

106. **Self-portrait as the Allegory of Painting (La Pittura) c.1638–9**

Oil on canvas

98.6 × 75.2 cm
Signed: **A.G.F.**

**Provenance**
Recorded by the Trustees of the Sale of Charles I in October 1649, at Hampton Court; sold to Jackson and others on 23 October 1651; recovered at the Restoration

**References**

**Artemisia Gentileschi** was one of the leading painters of seventeenth-century Italy and arguably the most influential woman artist of the Baroque age. Like many female artists of the period, she studied with her father, Orazio Gentileschi (see nos. 104–105) introduced her to the idealism of central Italian art and the dramatic realism of Caravaggio (nos. 91–2). While her early technical manner owes much to the art of Orazio, her inventive and emotive compositions demonstrate her formation as an independent artistic personality. She worked at various times in Rome, Florence and Naples before being invited in 1638 by Charles I to come to London to join her father, who had been working in England since 1626. It was probably during her brief English sojourn (1638–c.1641) that she produced this painting.

On one level the work depicts an allegorical figure of Painting, and was described as such in Charles I’s inventory. Artemisia follows the standard emblematic handbook of the period, the Iconologia of Cesare Ripa, where Painting is described as ‘a beautiful woman, with full black hair, dishevelled, and twisted in various ways, with arched eyebrows that show imaginative thought, the mouth covered with a cloth tied behind her ears, with a chain of gold at her throat from which hangs a mask, and has written in front “imitation”’. Artemisia captures the essentials of this description, leaving out the inscription on the mask and the gagged mouth, intended to symbolise that Painting is dumb. With clothes of evanescently coloured drapery, she holds a brush in one hand and a palette in the other. The work is also, however, a self-portrait: as a woman artist, Artemisia identifies herself as the female personification of Painting. There are precedents for this conflation of identities in representations of female artists. The portrait medal struck by Felice Antonio Casoni, celebrating the Bolognese painter Lavinia Fontana, depicts on the obverse a profile portrait of the artist, while on the reverse appears an allegory of Painting (fig. 128). Artemisia here fuses two established visual traditions within a single image.

Few of Artemisia’s self-portraits survive and the references to them in the artist’s correspondence only hint at what others might have looked like. An engraving by Jerome David after a painted self-portrait of Artemisia (fig. 129), a bronze medal of 1625–8, and the portrait of her by Simon Vouet (private collection, Bergamo) are additional visual sources which may hint at her likeness. Her self-portrait has been identified in many other of her paintings, such as her Woman with Lute (Curtis Galleries, Minneapolis) and the recently attributed Self-portrait as a Female Martyr (private collection), and in many of her other religious paintings, which give some indication of how she represented herself.

It is clear that Artemisia’s image was very much in demand among seventeenth-century...
collectors, who were attracted by her outstanding artistic abilities and her unusual status as a female artist. The Roman collector and antiquarian Cassiano dal Pozzo was one of her strongest supporters. Writing to him in 1630, she notes: 'I have painted my portrait with the utmost care'; in a later letter, she promises that she is sending 'my portrait, which you once requested'. Some scholars have suggested that these two letters refer to the Royal Collection painting, which for some reason Artemisia never sent to Dal Pozzo, but instead brought with her to England. In 1630 she would have been in her mid-thirties, which corresponds with the apparent age in the present picture. However, it would have been odd for Artemisia to break her promise to send the self-portrait mentioned in her letter to Cassiano dal Pozzo, one of her most prestigious patrons. Certain scholars have inclined to the view that the Cassiano self-portrait has been lost and that this is another, completed after Artemisia’s arrival in London in 1638 (when she was 46 years old).

Artemisia wears a brown apron over her green dress and seems to be leaning on a stone slab used for grinding pigments, in which the reflection of her left arm is visible. Underdrawing along her left arm may indicate where she marked out a position for her arm: quick, expert brushwork can be seen in the way in which she has depicted this arm as barely suggested. The area of brown behind her has been interpreted as background, or as a blank canvas on which she is about to paint. It looks like prepared canvas and was always thinly painted, but it is worn and may bear a closer resemblance than was the artist’s intention. She used the ground left exposed to suggest areas of shadow: particularly striking is the rolled-up sleeve of her right arm, where fluid strokes of white delineating the edge of her sleeve meet the brown shadow of exposed ground. The positions of the fingers of her right hand are different in infra-red reflectography and x-radiography, suggesting that the artist was resolving this area as she worked, eventually lengthening the index finger.

As a self-portrait the painting is particularly sophisticated and accomplished. The position in which Artemisia has portrayed herself would have been extremely difficult for the artist to capture, yet the work is economically painted, with very few pentiments. In order to view her own image she may have arranged two mirrors on either side of herself, facing each other. Depicting herself in the act of painting in this challenging pose, the angle and position of her head would have been the hardest to render accurately, requiring skilful visualisation.

With this fascinating work Artemisia Gentileschi contributed to seventeenth-century visual arguments concerning the elevated status of the artist.

1 ‘Artemisia Gentileschi fecit’.
3 Garrard (1989) dates this painting to the early 1630s; Bissell (1999) and more recently Judith Mann (2005) have argued that its style accords better with a date of 1638–40.
4 The work is described at Hampton Court as ‘A Pintura. A paintinge: by Arthemisia’, valued at £10 and sold to Jackson on 23 October 1651 (Millar 1970a, p. 191, no. 97). There is another reference to a self-portrait, also at Hampton Court, ‘Arthemisia gentelisco. done by her selfe’, valued at £20 and also sold to Jackson on 25 October 1651 (see Millar 1972a, p. 186, no. 5). Levey (1991, p. 91) argued that these two referred to the same painting. Bissell (1999, p. 274) has suggested that there were two paintings, intended as a pair.
5 Ripa 1986 edn, p. 357.
107. **Jacob Peeling the Rods c. 1650**

Oil on canvas  
Signed on dog’s collar: **GUIDO CAGNACCI**  
148.8 x 186.5 cm  
RCIN 406088

**PROVENANCE**

In the Marquis Cassanedi sale, London, 1730 (3), bought by Lord Malpas; possibly bought by Frederick, Prince of Wales, as recorded in his collection in July 1750, or by George III; in the Warm Room at Buckingham House c.1774; seen by Horace Walpole at Buckingham House in 1783.

**REFERENCES**

Levey 1991, no. 364; Rimini 1993, no. 35.

Guido Cagnacci was born in the small town of Sant’Arcangelo di Romagna, but in 1618 his father sent him to study in Bologna, thereby launching what was to become a dramatic and eventful career.1 Following his early training in Bologna, by 1621 he was working in Rome in the workshop of Guercino. In 1628 he returned north to work in Rimini, where he tried unsuccessfully to elope with the local noble widow, Teodora Stivivi. As a result, Cagnacci was banned from the city and these events had an enduring impact on his professional life. Subsequently he worked in Urbania and Forli, developing a mature style based on the classicising manner of the modern Bolognese school and the warm and luminous colours of sixteenth-century north Italian painters such as Correggio and Veronese. During the latter period of his career he shifted from working on large religious commissions to smaller works for private patrons. Living under an assumed name in Venice in 1650, he became deeply immersed in the Venetian manner; in his last years his considerable reputation earned him the role of court painter to Emperor Leopold I in Vienna.

The subject of the present work is taken from Genesis 30: 37. Jacob has married both of Laban’s daughters, Leah and Rachel (seen here flanking him), and has negotiated half of Laban’s flocks as dowry. Son- and father-in-law have arranged the division according to a simple formula: all speckled sheep and goats are Jacob’s and all pure white ones are Laban’s. Jacob decides to tip the odds in his favour and he prepares striped switches (in the centre foreground), whips the ewes with them (in the background, though not recorded in Genesis) and immerses the sticks in the drinking trough (in the left foreground) so that the ewes see them as they drink: ‘And since they bred when they came to drink, the flocks bred in front of the rods and so the flock brought forth striped, speckled and spotted.’ All Jacob’s efforts at genetic modification mean that the flock produce a large number of speckled lambs. The subject is unusual in seventeenth-century Italian painting, and Cagnacci’s inventive composition draws attention to the figures in the foreground, while the narrative events of the Old Testament story are depicted in the background.

The scene takes place in an idyllic pastoral landscape with a low horizon framed by a vast and luminous sky. Cagnacci has expertly modelled the figures through the use of tonal contrasts and atmospheric light so that they stand, lit against the vast sky that dominates the background behind them. Typical of Cagnacci’s Venetian period, this painting demonstrates the artist’s skill at combining warm colours with heightened chiaroscuro in a naturalistic manner. Indeed, the stylistic qualities of this work date it to the 1650s, during the artist’s later years in Venice and before his move to Vienna. In particular, many similarities can be noted between the present painting and two other works of Cagnacci’s Venetian period, *The Virgin Reading a Book* (private collection) and the *Woman Beating Two Dogs* (Borromeo collection, Italy). The female figural types in all three works are particularly analogous, as is the artist’s style of painting, dependent on thick impasto applied in an elegant and painterly manner.

Particular similarities can also be drawn between this painting and Cagnacci’s other work of the 1650s, specifically in the colours and tones of the background and the sky. Following the recent conservation of the painting, the long-assumed warm yellows and dark orange tones of the background have revealed a bright blue sky filled with white clouds.3 The artist’s signature is painted on the collar of the dog seated in the lower right-hand corner of the canvas.

Additions to the canvas have been noted along the top and right-hand edges of the canvas: Cagnacci may have intended these to be part of the original work, or he may have added them during the course of painting or shortly thereafter to expand the tightly cropped composition.4 At least two other works by Cagnacci were also painted on canvas made of more than one piece: *Martha Rebuking Mary for Her Vanity* (Norton Simon Museum, Pasadena) is made up of four pieces of canvas sewn together, while *Cleopatra* (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) is constructed from seven distinct parts.5 These other signed works also date from the later period of Cagnacci’s career.

1 The most complete studies of the artist are Rimini 1993 and Pasini 1986. Considerable debate still surrounds the early training that Cagnacci received in Bologna, as it is not entirely clear with whom he primarily studied. Malvasia (1841 edn, ii, p. 60) states that Cagnacci studied with Guido Reni, while Scannelli (1657, p. 169) recorded him as working with Ludovico Carracci.
2 A similar painting attributed to Cagnacci was held in the House of Liechtenstein’s Princely collection until the last months of the Second World War. Unfortunately this work remains lost and no photographs of it are known.
3 Conservation carried out by Britta New in 2006.
4 16.3 cm of canvas was added to the upper edge and 14.5 cm to the right edge. The additions overlap the original canvas and were adhered with glue rather than being sewn on.
5 The author would like to thank Gloria Williams of Norton Simon Museum and Wolfgang Prohaska of the Kunsthistorisches Museum for sharing information concerning the paintings in their respective collections.
Guercino (Giovanni Francesco Barbieri)
Cento, Emilia 1591–Bologna 1666

108. The Libyan Sibyl 1651

Oil on canvas
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RCIN 405340
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Ippolito Cattani, 1651; probably bought for George III by Richard Dalton in Italy in the early 1760s
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Guercino (‘The Squinter’) was raised in the small town of Cento, 15 miles north of Bologna, and began his apprenticeship at the late age of 16. In 1621 his patron, Cardinal Alessandro Ludovisi, was elected Pope Gregory XV, and Guercino was called to Rome, executing several important commissions (see no. 125) before returning to Cento on the Pope’s early death in 1623. In Rome, Guercino was profoundly affected by the classicism of Domenichino and Guido Reni (see nos. 98–9): he modified his dramatic chiaroscuro, lightened his colours and started to arrange his compositions more architecturally.

Despite the provincial location of his workshop in Cento, Guercino attracted international patronage: Charles I tried to lure him to the English court, but he declined on the grounds that the country was heretical and the climate terrible.1 After the death of Guido Reni in 1642, he finally moved to Bologna, but his later years were plagued by ill health and he came to depend more and more on his workshop assistants, particularly his nephews Cesare and Benedetto Gennari (of whom the latter later moved to London to work for Charles II).

Guercino painted sibyls throughout his career, especially in the 1640s and 1650s (for a discussion of their significance see no. 104).2 The Libyan Sibyl had prophesied the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles. Guercino has not included her usual attribute of a lighted torch here, identifying her instead by means of the inscription on the book.3 This is an example of Guercino’s late work, in which the strong chiaroscuro of his early years has been lightened with paler tonalities and his style has become refined and classical. The effects of light and dark, with the Sibyl’s face caught in half-shadow, recall his earlier work, but are more subtle, the handling of paint more delicate and economical. The sensuality of the flesh and the warmth of the drapery give the figure more humanity than comparable figures by Guido Reni: the cool blue of her dress is set off by the striking clash of colours in the pastel pink and orange brown of her mantle and the deep red, possibly velvet, of her dress. The few colours are subtly modulated and simply counterbalanced by the white of her turban and the knotted sash at her waist. The sibyl has a noble grandeur despite the modest size of the painting. Her concentration on her reading, oblivious of the viewer, gives a poetic quality to the painting. The Sibyl’s dress was originally higher across her left shoulder, but there appear to be few other visible pentiments.4

The painting has been identified as one of two half-length sibyls painted for Ippolito Cattani (or Cattanio) of Bologna, for which Guercino received 120 ducatonii (or 150 scudi) on 4 December 1651.5 The pendant is The Samian Sibyl (private collection; fig. 130): the pairing was apt, since both sibyls were associated with the island of Samos. A workshop replica of The Samian Sibyl was sold to the Grand Duke of Tuscany in 1777 and appears in the foreground of Johan Zoffany’s Tribuna (Royal Collection) of 1772, possibly as a compliment to King George III on his excellent purchase of the present work.6 Whereas the Libyan Sibyl remains absorbed in her reading, the Samian Sibyl looks heavenwards, her hands resting on her book, her turban a rich green and red. Both works have the distinctive spelling of the word ‘sibyl’ as ‘sybilla’, which Guercino seems to have corrected a few years later to ‘sibylla’.7

2 Other examples are The Persian Sibyl (1647; Pinacoteca Capitolina, Rome); The Cumaean Sibyl (1638; Credito Emiliano, Reggio Emilia); The Libyan Sibyl with a Putto (1647; private collection, England); The Libyan Sibyl with a Putto (1651; Denis Mahon collection); The Persian Sibyl (1651; Althorp, Northamptonshire).
3 The Libyan Sibyl had foretold the ‘coming of the day when that which is hidden shall be revealed’. This is possibly a reference to the Nunc Dimittis spoken by Simeon at the presentation of Christ in the Temple (Luke 2: 22–35).
4 There is a paper label on the back of the stretcher: ‘No. 11 Warm Room’ documenting its display in Buckingham Palace; a red label, ‘King’s Council Chamber’; a William IV brand on the frame and stretcher from when the painting was hung at Windsor. The painting was cleaned by Haines in 1901 and by Nancy Stocker in 1964.
5 Mahon 1968b, pp. 197–8, no. 91; Ghelfi 1997, p. 155. The payment is noted in the Libro dei Conti (Calvi 1808, Notizie, p. 130; Malvasia 1841 edn, i, p. 333). The two paintings were also recorded in 1651 by Malvasia, Felsina Pittrice (1658, ii, p. 379; 1841, ii, p. 269); Salerno 1888, no. 286; Levey 1991, no. 521; London 1991b, no. 31.
7 Mahon excluded the later Samian Sibyl (Palazzo Reale, Genoa) as the pendant in favour of this one in the 1968 exhibition. The spelling ‘sybilla’ is also on the two full-length Cumaean and Samian sibyls (Mahon collection and Althorp) painted in the same year, but was corrected for the Genoa painting dated 1652–3. See Salerno 1983, p. 356; 1988, p. 357; Mahon in Bologna 1991, p. 356.

Fig. 130 Guercino, The Samian Sibyl, oil on canvas, 116 × 95 cm (Private collection)
CARLO DOLCI
Florence 1616–1687

109. Salome with the Head of St John the Baptist c.1665–70

Oil on canvas
126.0 × 102.0 cm
RCIN 405619
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One of the most outstanding painters of the Florentine Baroque, Carlo Dolci held a well-established reputation both in Italy and abroad during the seventeenth century. He entered the workshop of Jacopo Vignali in Florence in 1625 at the age of 9, and spent most of his working life in the Tuscan city. Patronised by the Medici court, the Florentine nobility and English travellers and ambassadors, Dolci was celebrated for his emotive rendering of religious subjects and his highly polished portrait studies. Throughout the course of his career he developed a distinctive style based on simple compositions with a meticulous attention to detail and an exacting surface finish.

This painting entered the Royal Collection as a gift from Sir John Finch to King Charles II. As English Resident at the court of Grand Duke Ferdinand II between 1665 and 1670, Finch met Carlo Dolci in Florence and had the opportunity to commission a number of works from him, including the self-portrait in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge. From the evidence in Finch’s notebooks, written during his sojourn in Florence, we know that he admired and befriended the artist. According to Dolci’s biographer Filippo Baldinucci, Finch commissioned this work and two companion paintings, the Mary Magdalene, also in the Royal Collection, and a David with the Head of Goliath, probably the version in the Brera.

According to Baldinucci, Dolci painted three versions of this subject, the first for Marchese Pier Francesco Rinuccini and the second ‘for John Finch, Resident in Florence for His Majesty the King of England, to whom the Resident gave it, and it was placed in the King’s own bedroom’. Of the third we have no evidence. The Royal Collection painting can be confidently identified as Dolci’s second version of the subject. Unfortunately the Rinuccini version was last heard of in 1870, and its whereabouts remain unknown. The subject quickly became popular with Dolci and his followers, and various subsequent versions of this composition exist.

The good condition of the painted surface of the canvas reveals the emphasis on detail that characterises much of Dolci’s work. Although criticised by his contemporaries, such as Luca Giordano, for his laborious and time-consuming method of painting, here the artist’s delicate handling gives his subject an arresting naturalism.

The story is told in two of the Gospels (Matthew 14: 3–12 and Mark 6: 17–29): St John the Baptist is in prison for denouncing the adulterous and incestuous liaison between King Herod and Herodias. Salome (Herodias’s daughter by a previous marriage) so delights the King with her dancing that he promises to give her anything she wants. Prompted by her mother, she asks for John the Baptist’s head on a platter. Dramatically presented standing against a dark background, Salome holds out the platter as if presenting it to the beholder, and yet turns away herself. She is depicted as an elegant and luxuriously dressed young lady: Dolci gives detailed attention to the subtle textures of her costume, and his scrupulous rendering of the ornate jewels on the bodice of her dress, as well as her shimmering pearl jewellery, emphasises the richness and refinement of her attire. While the artist’s depiction draws attention to Salome’s lavish costume and elegant manner, he also captures her melancholy distraction as she appears unable to come to terms with the evidence of her own role in this brutal murder.

1 The notable catalogue raisonné by Francesca Baldassari (1995) provides the most recent discussion of the artist and his work. See also Baldassari 2002.
4 Baldassari 1845–7 edn, V, p. 351. In his description of the work, Baldinucci confuses Salome with her mother, Herodias, but from the age of the figure in the painting this seems an obvious error on the part of the biographer.
5 The earlier version remained in the possession of the Rinuccini family until 1852 when it was sold to Prince Anton Demidoff. The last notice of the painting appears in 1870, when Demidoff sold it in Paris to Rosard de la Salle. Interestingly, from the description and engraving included in the 1852 sale catalogue the figure of Salome in the Rinuccini version does not wear bracelets, yet these are included in the Royal Collection painting. See: ‘Collection de San Donato… tableaux, marbres, dessins … etc’, Paris 1870, p. 110, no. 148. An annotated copy of the catalogue, with prices and names of buyers, is held in the British Library (81.0781.1.d.40).
6 Among the many copies are those held in Glasgow City Museum and Art Gallery and the Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden.
LUCA GIORDANO  
Naples 1634–1705  

110. The Story of Cupid and Psyche c. 1695–7  
Oil on copper

Provenance  
All twelve paintings were probably commissioned by Carlos II of Spain (1661–1700) or his mother, Mariana of Austria (1634–96), and have stayed together ever since. Recorded in 1722 as having been given by Carlos’s Queen, Maria Anna von Pfalz-Neuburg (1667–1740), to the Duc de Grammont after the King’s death in 1700; probably in the Duc de Grammont’s sale, Paris, 1715; Jacques Meijers sale, Rotterdam, 9 ff. September 1722 (lot 11); at Sir Gregory Turner’s house at Blackheath, where they were seen by Vertue in June 1741 (‘said to be bought in Holland’), by Dodsley in 1761 (London and its Environs, 1761) and by Horace Walpole in 1779. Acquired by George III and recorded in the Bedchamber at Buckingham House c. 1792.
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Luca Giordano was summoned to Spain by Carlos II in 1692 and became his court painter in 1694. In his biography of the artist, Antonio Palomino relates:

Luca came to Madrid, where he painted in oils various stories from Sacred Scriptures in different sizes for the Buen Retiro and for the palace of our lady the Queen Mother and some paintings on copper, both of fables and of sacred subjects, imitating (by order of the King) some of the eminent painters of old, such as Raphael, Correggio, Titian and Il Spagnoletto [Ribera].…¹

The ‘paintings on copper’ in all probability include this series. If Mariana (Marie-Anne of Austria), the Queen Mother, had commissioned them, then her death on 23 May 1696 may explain why the set seems to be unfinished (see below). However, as the panels were later given to the Duc de Grammont by Carlos II’s second wife, Maria Anna von Pfalz-Neuburg, she may have commissioned the series instead.² The fact that the mention of the commissioning of paintings on copper occurs between other well-known and dated commissions has led to general acceptance that the Story of Psyche is dated c. 1695–7.³

Apart from this series, only about eight other paintings on copper by Luca Giordano survive today: a few date from the 1680s, the rest from his time in Spain. Some are autograph replicas of larger paintings on canvas.⁴ Painting on copper flourished at the end of the sixteenth
century and survived into the seventeenth; Luca Giordano would have known the unique set of giant paintings on copper by Domenichino, Stanzzone and Jusepe de Ribera in his native city of Naples (Cappella del Tesoro of the cathedral). Although in decline by the 1690s, painting on copper was still appreciated for small-scale, jewel-like works, particularly at the Spanish court. Copper’s non-absorbent, smooth and reflective surface gives oil paint a particular glossiness of texture and luminosity of colour; it also facilitates the depiction of fine detail. Giordano uses it less for the detail than as a support for rich and fluent painting, brilliant with intense colour while forms maintain their softness. The present works are more finished than his oil sketches, but similar in their lively and spontaneous character.

The compositions were laid out in detail in a grisaille underpainting (shades of grey) over a thin pink-brown ground. The paintings were then completed with a relatively simple build-up of opaque and translucent paint layers, allowing the light and dark modelling of the grisaille to contribute to the final appearance. For example, red drapery is given a deeper colour by the underlying grey, whilst blues are intensified and flesh tones and pale drapery achieve a soft, cool quality (figs. 131, 132). Giordano allowed the grey to show through as a mid-tone in many passages of shadow and background, and it is often visible at the extreme edges of the panels (usually hidden by the frames). Technically this
was both economical and sophisticated, and matches the superb assurance of Giordano at this stage of his career. This series seems to be the only example of Giordano’s use of this technique.\(^6\)

The subject comes from *The Metamorphoses or Golden Ass* by the second-century AD writer Apuleius: it is one of the stories that intersperse the main narrative of Lucius on his travels (Book iv, para. 28 – Book vi, para. 24). The tale of the many travails endured by ill-matched lovers (one mortal and one divine) before their final happy marriage, was interpreted in the Renaissance as a Neoplatonic allegory of the progress of the soul (*Psyche* means ‘soul’ in Greek) towards salvation through Divine Love. The outcome of their union is Pleasure.

The most famous depiction of this subject in the Renaissance was Raphael’s series of frescoes for the Loggia of the Chigi Palace (now the Farnesina) executed in 1518–19. It is generally agreed that Raphael intended to paint more scenes from the same story than those that now survive, or that he was perhaps planning a set of tapestries to hang beneath the frescoes in the vault.\(^7\) His unexecuted ideas for this commission or the existing frescoes in the Loggia are thought to have inspired a set of thirty-four prints of c.1532 after designs by Michael Coxie (engraved by Agostino Veneziano and the so-called ‘Master of the Die’; see fig. 133).\(^8\) Whether Coxie was copying lost Raphael drawings or merely inventing his own designs in a Raphaelesque manner, these prints provided the definitive depiction of the Cupid and Psyche story. Luca Giordano uses the general arrangement of his source but makes everything more dynamic: instead of a frieze-like arrangement he introduces movement into depth; he allows the edges of the panels to crop figures and architecture, particularly in the first three scenes, so that we imagine the scene continuing on either side of the frame; his figures fly amid smoke and clouds, and swirling, opulent drapery. Giordano often adds bystanders to heighten the drama, or to address us like a Greek chorus. In the prints Cupid, the God of Love, is the familiar boy-with-bow; in Giordano, as in Raphael, he is old enough to be a lover himself.

Giordano had more immediate sources of inspiration than a set of 150-year-old prints. The story of Psyche was already popular in Spain, read in Spanish and Catalan adaptations, as well as Italian, and often referred to in philosophical debates at the Spanish court about the theme of Divine Love.\(^9\) There were also painted versions of the story in Spain: a Velázquez *Psyche and Cupid* of c.1659 for the Hall of Mirrors in the Alcázar, Madrid (lost in a fire of 1734); and an important cycle of ceiling paintings of the 1680s by Claudio Coello (completed by Palomino, Sebastián Muñoz, Isidoro Arredondo and Jan van Kessel) decorating the apartments of Maria Louise of Orleans, Carlos II’s first Queen (also lost in the fire of 1734).\(^10\) Coello and his colleagues used a different literary source: one scene shows Psyche in the desert surrounded by wild animals after the palace had disappeared; another shows Psyche visited by her father and sisters in Cupid’s palace.\(^11\) Two tapestries of the subject also recorded in the Alcázar were the work of the official tapestry works.\(^12\) When Luca Giordano arrived in Spain he was famous for being able to paint effectively on a vast scale and to adapt his style to different commissions. His earliest Neapolitan style had
Fig. 133 Agostino Veneziano after Michael Coxie, *Psyche's Father Consulting the Oracle*, engraving, 19.7 × 22.9 cm (cropped) (British Museum, London)

Fig. 134 Luca Giordano, *Psyche served by invisible spirits*; black chalk and wash, 22.4 × 34.7 cm (Royal Palace, Madrid)

110.v *Psyche Served by Invisible Spirits*
57.8 × 68.9 cm
**RCIN 402562**

110.vi *Cupid Visiting the Sleeping Psyche*
54.9 × 69.2 cm
Signed by the artist on foot of bed: Jordanus. F.; inscribed in pencil on back of copper: J Meijers
**RCIN 406770**
been lightened by the influence of Pietro da Cortona, Bernini, and Rubens’s fluid handling of paint. Compared to his earlier work the series has the languid air of Guido Reni, although the way in which the figures project into the foreground and are cut by the frame gives energy to compositions. Giordano’s careful study of Venetian art, particularly Veronese, is seen in architecture silhouetted against sky, onlookers clasping columns, opulent drapery and the dominance of blues and yellows. His late Baroque style has an airy grace and refinement, with forms dissolving in softer pastel colours. In the landscapes, forms are painted ‘wet-in-wet’, and become indistinguishable from each other.

There are twelve surviving paintings on copper in the series by Giordano, all in the Royal Collection, which tell only half of the story of Cupid and Psyche. In Apuleius’s story the beauty of Psyche, the third daughter of a king and queen, is so great that people pay homage to her rather than the goddess Venus: ‘as she walked the streets the people crowded to adore her with garlands and flowers’. In her jealousy Venus summons Cupid, ‘that winged son of hers, that most reckless of creatures’, and commands him to arouse in her a burning love for an unworthy husband, ‘cursed by Fortune in rank, in estate, in condition so that Psyche would be mortified’. In the first painting in Giordano’s series (no. 110.i) Venus is shown pointing out Psyche to Cupid who, contrary to plan, falls in love with her.

Although praised for her beauty, no potential husband presents himself to Psyche. Her parents, afraid that they have unwittingly incurred the anger of the gods, consult the oracle of Apollo and are told that Psyche’s future husband is no mortal lover, but a monster (‘something cruel and fierce and serpentine’), and that Psyche must be left exposed on a mountain peak, in ‘funeral wedlock ritually arrayed’. Giordano’s second painting (no. 110.ii) shows Psyche’s parents sacrificing at the Temple of Apollo at Miletus before consulting the oracle (though according to Apuleius only her father made the journey). The composition is dominated by a surge upwards and to the right as figures and animals kneel before the statue, and great clouds of smoke rise from the sacrifice. It is interesting to compare this composition with the Coxié print of the same subject (fig. 133).

The oracle’s words of doom are followed by several days of mourning; Psyche and her parents are then led in a procession to a funeral–wedding ceremony, after which they return home sorrowfully, leaving Psyche on a mountain peak. The west wind, Zephyrus, saves her, carrying her to the flower-covered valley below. The third of Giordano’s paintings (no. 110.iii) shows Psyche lying on the rock at upper right; her empty bridal chair is carried away in the foreground by the lamenting people, led by her parents. In the centre of the sky Psyche is borne away by Zephyrus. She is wafted down to ‘this soft grassy spot’ where she wakes to find a grove of lofty trees, a spring of clear water and a palace built by ‘arts divine’. In the fourth painting (no. 110.iv) Psyche is shown three times: at the upper left, reclining on clouds blown by Zephyrus; resting on the ground at lower left; and in the centre, discovering the spring, here interpreted as a magnificent fountain by Cupid’s palace. She is welcomed into the palace by the voice of an invisible attendant inviting her to rest and
bathe, after which she feasts. But the waiting maids are nothing but voices to her and the food is wafted in, as if on the wind. After the feast she is entertained by music from invisible performers. Giordano’s scene (no. 110.v) shows her bathing on the left, with the help of attendants, while two invisible attendants bring her a table of food in the centre. Musicians play in the right foreground and upper right, while Cupid directs operations from the upper left. Here Giordano follows the text, rather than the Coxie engraving, in showing Cupid as an unseen presence rather than embracing Psyche, so that she dines in isolation; the idea of a magical banquet is suggested by the table borne through the air by ethereal servants.

The only known preparatory drawing for Giordano’s series is for this scene, a chalk and wash sheet in the Library of the Royal Palace, Madrid (fig. 134). The most important variation from the drawing is the turning of the listening Cupid towards the viewer in a more elegant pose and the simplification of the composition by the elimination of two attendants on either side of Psyche’s throne.

Cupid comes to Psyche’s bed when night is well advanced and flees before dawn, and does not allow her to see him. Here (no. 110.vi) Cupid looks up at a female figure holding a bed curtain (symbolising night), while another holds her finger to her lips, possibly to symbolise the secrecy of their union. Shortly afterwards Cupid tells Psyche that she is bearing his child. Psyche’s isolation makes her palace seem a splendid prison; she wishes her sisters might visit her so that she can reassure them of her well-being. Cupid unwillingly gives his consent; Zephyrus brings the sisters three times. Envious of the delights enjoyed by Psyche, they persuade her that her husband is a serpentine monster who will devour her and advise her to kill ‘it’ while it sleeps. To do this she needs a lamp to see by and a knife to wound. Giordano shows Psyche on a garden terrace, holding the lamp and knife and standing between her two sisters; they appear again in the right background being ferried by Zephyrus (no. 110.vii). The old woman in the foreground holding a mask symbolises Deceit. Although not in the text, Giordano includes the listening Cupid at top left. This detail makes sense of the story, as Cupid is fully aware of the sisters’ plans and tries in vain to warn Psyche of them.

When Cupid is asleep Psyche illuminates his beautiful youthful figure (no. 110.viii): a milk-white neck, and rosy cheeks over which there strayed coils of hair becomingly arranged, some hanging in front, some behind, shining with such extreme brilliance that the lamplight itself flickered uncertainly. On the shoulders of the flying god wings sparkled dewy-white with glittering sheen, and though they were at rest the delicate down at their edges quivered and rippled in incessant play. The rest of the god’s body was smooth and shining and such as Venus need not be ashamed of in her son. At the foot of the bed lay a bow, a quiver and arrows, the gracious weapons of the great god.

Psyche examines Cupid’s arrows and accidentally pricks herself, thus falling in love with Love. Unfortunately, as she leans over him a drop of hot lamp oil falls on his shoulder. He wakes and flies off without a word; Psyche catches him by the leg and ‘trailing attendance
through the clouds she clung on below’. Two figures watch the scene through parted bed curtains, while against a moonlit sky Cupid flies away with Psyche clinging to his leg, her knife and lamp, still burning, abandoned on the ground.

Psyche eventually falls to the ground in exhaustion and Cupid alights in a nearby tree, from where he upbraids and then leaves her. In despair Psyche throws herself into the river, which ‘in respect it would seem for the god’ refuses to let her drown. Instead it lands her on a grassy bank where Pan is sitting; he advises Psyche not to despair and to try to regain Cupid’s favour. Giordano shows Cupid castigating the kneeling Psyche from a tree (no. 110.ix). In the middle distance she throws herself into the river and on the left she stands, arranging her hair, before Pan, the goat-god surrounded by his sheep.

Psyche now begins her search for Cupid, who lies wounded in his mother’s chamber. A tern finds Venus bathing in the sea and tells her of the suffering of Cupid, now in love with Psyche. Apuleius makes no mention of the great maritime retinue depicted by Giordano (no. 110.x), with Venus seated on two dolphins, surrounded by tritons and nereids, as the white bird tells her the news. In Apuleius this scene occurs earlier on (Book iv, para. 31), after Venus has instructed Cupid to humiliate Psyche and returns to the sea, where the nereids sing in harmony and a triton sounds on his loud horn. Although the text below the print simply describes the tern as an *augella*, meaning ‘bird’, the tritons with trident and conch shell and the nereids are the same as in Giordano’s painting.

Cupid takes refuge in Venus’s room, where she chides him for disobeying her and marrying Psyche. She rushes out to meet Juno and Ceres and asks for their help in finding Psyche. They try in vain to soothe Venus’s rage and defend Cupid, reminding Venus that he is now a young man. Giordano shows Cupid lying on a bed, holding his wounded left arm, which is touched with bright red (no. 110.xi). Venus castigates him, her doves behind her, her dolphins in the distance. Behind Cupid is possibly an allegory of Sobriety, who is mentioned in Apuleius’s text, although the figure has no distinguishing attributes and may be just an attendant, as in previous scenes. Venus appears again at upper right, conversing with Juno (with peacock) and Ceres (crowned with ears of corn).

Next Apuleius describes how Psyche is rebuffed by Ceres and Juno and decides to appeal to Venus herself; but Venus punishes her, with the help of Care and Sorrow, and then sets her a series of increasingly difficult tasks. The final scene in this series (no. 110.xii) probably represents the naked Venus, her attendant behind her, setting Psyche her third task – to obtain water from a high rock guarded by dragons. In Apuleius, Psyche points up to ‘the top of the steep mountain that looms over that lofty crag’; she is helped to achieve the task by Jupiter’s eagle. Giordano gives no indication of the black spring or the vessel with which to collect the water. This makes the identification of this scene difficult. If this is indeed the scene depicted here, then this is the final one in Luca Giordano’s series.

To complete the story we must return to Apuleius or study the remaining fourteen prints from the Coxe series. As a final task Psyche is sent to the underworld to collect a
little of Proserpine’s beauty in a casket, which she must not open. Unfortunately on her return she is overcome with curiosity: she opens the casket and falls into a death-like sleep. Cupid, who cannot bear to be parted from Psyche, rouses her with a touch of his arrow. Mercury is ordered by Jupiter to summon all the gods to an assembly, to which Psyche is brought by Mercury and introduced into heaven. She is handed a cup of ambrosia. ‘Take this, Psyche, and be immortal. Never shall Cupid leave the tie that binds you, but this marriage shall be perpetual for you both.’ A lavish wedding feast follows and in due time Cupid and Psyche have a daughter, Pleasure.

1 Palomino 1987 edn, p. 352. Palomino may have realised that the series was based on a Raphael source.
2 She probably owned two oils on copper now in Aschaffenburg, Solomon and the Queen of Sheba and Esther and Ahasuerus (Ferrari and Scavizzi 1992, nos. 6536, 6537), which are closest to our series in date and technique.
3 Ferrari and Scavizzi (1992) date them c. 1698; Prohaska in Los Angeles 2001, p. 312, dates them c.1697–8. The author would like to thank Andrés Ubeda De Los Cobos for his assistance.
4 See Ferrari and Scavizzi 1992, nos. 6536, 6537, 6504, 44144 and b, 6566a, 3377; Los Angeles 2001, nos. 73b, 97c, 97d, 135, 136.
5 Bowron in Phoenix 1998, pp. 15–16.
6 It is not present in the two similar copiers in the Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Aschaffenburg. The author is grateful to Cornelia Syre for arranging for these works to be examined. Six panels of the Royal Collection were conserved by Lucilla Kingsbury in 1977 and the remaining six by Anna Sandén. There are slight variations in the quality of the finish between them, but this does not raise questions over their authorship.
7 Rome 1985, pp. 15–16.
8 The Master of the Die has been variously indentified with Bernardo Daddi or Dado, Benedetto Verini and Tommaso Vincidor; Bartsch i, nos. 211–24, 39–70; Boorsch 1982, xxix, pp. 195–227. Giordano used prints as a source for pictorial ideas throughout his career: Ferrari and Scavizzi 2003, pp. 8–24; Leuschner 1994, pp. 184–9.
11 Palomino 1987 edn, pp. 333, 368. A drawing attributed to Arredono of Psyche discovering Cupid is not close to the Giordano, apart from the motif of Psyche holding onto Cupid in the background (López Torrijos 1985, fig. 167).
12 Ferrari and Scavizzi 1992, no. 6536.
13 The second half of the story may have been lost, or more likely the project was interrupted by a more urgent commission, or by the death of the Queen Mother in 1696: it is rare for Luca Giordano, whose facility with the brush was legendary, to leave any project incomplete.
14 All quotes from Apuleius translation by Kenney, 1990.
15 Ferrari and Scavizzi 1992, i, no. d175.
16 Apuleius, Book v, par. 22 (1990 edn), p. 75.
17 Coxie treated this subject as an addition to his series, but his image does not relate to this painted version: see the print Venus Ordering Psyche to Seek Water from a Fountain Guarded by Dragons which should belong in the series, but has no text and is at the end in Boorsch 1982, xxix, pp. 227.
18 Fourteen including the print showing Venus ordering Psyche to Seek Water from a Fountain Guarded by Dragons; otherwise, thirteen.
LUDOVICO CARRACCI
Bologna 1555–1619

111. A seated male nude c.1590

Black and white chalks and oiled charcoal on blue paper
34.0 × 23.7 cm
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Many of the works of Ludovico, Agostino and
Annibale Carracci (see also nos. 88–90, 112–14,
120) in Bologna were collaborations, including
three friezes decorating the upper walls of
rooms in the Palazzo Fava (now the Museo
Civico Medievale), illustrating the stories of
Europa, of Jason and the Argonauts, and of
Aeneas. The present drawing is a study for one
of the monochrome figure groups dividing the
twelve narrative scenes in the frieze of the Sala
d’Eneide, and shows a companion of Aeneas
crushing a harpy (fig. 135).

The Carracci’s biographer Carlo Cesare
Malvasia related that they received the initial
commission because Antonio, father of
Agostino and Annibale, was tailor to Count
Filippo Fava, and that they agreed to carry out
the work for a very low price.1 The date 1584
painted under the figure of Jupiter must be
the terminus ante quem for the Jason frieze,
and the Europa cycle was probably painted
concurrently. There is no external evidence
for the date of the frieze in the Sala d’Eneide;
Malvasia’s description of the whole project
implies that the Aeneas frieze followed straight
on from that of Jason, but this has been ques-
tioned. Any date based on the style of the frieze
is compromised by the condition of the fresco,
and the chronology of Ludovico’s drawings in
the 1580s and 1590s is not precise enough to
allow a date to be determined on the basis of
the few known preparatory studies for the
project (including two compositional studies
by Ludovico for the narrative scenes, recently
discovered in Genoa2). A couple of years either
side of 1590 is likely, but it is not possible to
be as precise as some scholars would claim.

Malvasia also stated that Fava commissioned
Ludovico to execute the entire Aeneas cycle
himself; that though Ludovico had wanted
Agostino to execute the chiaroscuro ornamentation surrounding the narrative scenes, this
was to no avail; and that he did manage to get
Annibale to paint three sections on the basis of
Ludovico’s designs.3 Ludovico’s responsibility
for the majority of the cycle has been broadly
accepted, with the caveats that Annibale was
not a mere executant but contributed to the
design of at least one of the scenes, and that
Agostino did in fact have a hand in the execution of a couple of the scenes and some of the
monochrome decoration.4

Ludovico’s authorship of the present
drawing and the corresponding figure group,
however, has never been questioned in modern
times. It has been seen as a prime example of
his early chalk drawings, though it is in fact
atypical of such sheets; the use of sticky oiled
charcoal over an outline drawing in black chalk
necessitated a simplification of the forms that
is at odds with the usual careful modulation of
Ludovico’s chalk nudes.

1 Malvasia 1678, p. 368.
2 Palazzo Rosso, Genoa, inv. 1195, 1282; Loisel 2000, p. 100.
3 Malvasia 1678, p. 373.
4 For discussions of the division of hands see
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112. The Adoration of the Shepherds c. 1592–4

Pen and ink over red chalk
40.5 × 26.2 cm
Inscribed on the verso, in two different hands: Anibal Carracci, and piu tosto d’Agostino with a paraph
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The drawing is an early study for Agostino Carracci’s painting of the Adoration of the Shepherds (fig. 136) in the Gessi Chapel of Santa Maria della Pioggia (also known as San Bartolomeo sul Reno), Bologna. The painting was badly damaged (and subsequently heavily restored) in 1944 by bombing, which destroyed the flanking paintings of the Nativity and Circumcision by Agostino’s cousin Ludovico.

Malvasia stated that Agostino painted the altarpiece when he was 27 years old, thus implying a date of 1584–5. But Malvasia is not always reliable, particularly when discussing the Carracci’s earlier works – he also claimed, for instance, that both Annibale’s Crucifixion (dated 1583) and Baptism (dated 1585) were painted when the artist was 18, that is, in 1578/9, and his dating of the Adoration has been repeatedly challenged. The chapel bears an inscription recording its ‘restoration’ by Pietro Francesco Gessi in 1595, and while this can only be taken as a terminus ante quem for the paintings, their style (as seen in old photographs) does suggest a date in the few years before 1595. It is odd that Malvasia should be so categorical if he had no firm grounds for dating the work; ‘27’ could have been a slip for ‘37’, but why would he mention Agostino’s age at all, if not to make a point about his youth?

All the elements of the final composition – including a pair of figures in the distant landscape – are present in this sketch, though reversed left to right; a second, much smaller sketch tucked into the side of the manger at lower left is hard to read, though it seems to include more bystanders. Also at Windsor are three pen sketches for the Madonna and Child and a shepherd, closer to the painting than here, and in the Louvre is a large black chalk study for the same shepherd. A chiaroscuro drawing of the composition also at Windsor is a pastiche of Agostino’s painting, probably by the little-known Giovanni Pietro Possenti, rather than a modello by Agostino.

On the reverse of the sheet is an early example of scholarly debate over the attribution of the Carracci’s drawings – one inscription stating that the drawing is by Annibale, followed by another opining ‘rather Agostino’, with an unidentified paraph or calligraphic mark of ownership. The same paraph is also found on a drawing by Camillo Procaccini in the Teyler Museum in Haarlem, but the early provenance of this drawing is not known.

1 The drawing was catalogued by Wittkower as the work of an imitator of Annibale Carracci; it was recognised as by Agostino by John Chevostal (note on mount, 1993) and Catherine Legrand (Legrand 1994, p. 52; see also Loisel-Legrand 1997, pp. 44, 50, note 22; Loisel 2004, pp. 47–9).

2 This statement is not to be found in the original edition of Felsina Pittrice, where the painting is not dated (Malvasia 1678, i, p. 392), but in the same author’s Pitture di Bologna (Malvasia 1686, p. 356; 1691 edition. See Summerscale 2000, pp. 146–7, note 142. 3 Respectively in Santa Maria della Carità and San Gregorio, Bologna; Malvasia 1678, i, p. 361. 4 Malvasia’s account was first questioned by Mahon in Bologna 1956, pp. 44–6, and rejected by Brogi 1985, pp. 264, 271, note 68; by Di Giampaolo 1989–90, p. 153 (as 1591); by Legrand 1994, p. 48; by Brogi 2001, p. 126 (as early 1590s); and by Loisel 2004, p. 47 (as c. 1592–1593). Bohn 2004, p. 229, accepted Malvasia’s dating of Agostino’s work, while proposing a date of c. 1592–4 for Ludovico’s contribution to the chapel. 5 Transcribed in Bodmer 1939, p. 131. 6 Wittkower 1952, nos. 90–92. 7 Legrand 1994, no. 30. 8 First published by Friedlaender in 1932, while noting the strong difference in character between the painting and the oil drawing. The attribution to Agostino was dismissed by Bodmer (1934, p. 66) but has been repeatedly endorsed (e.g. Wittkower 1952, no. 89; Bologna 1956, no. 44; Bologna 1984, no. 99; Di Giampaolo 1989–90, p. 155, note 12, noting however the graphic similarities of the sheet to Mastellata and Facchin; Legrand 1994, under no. 30). Further drawings at Windsor probably by Possenti, who is the subject of a forthcoming article by the author, include Wittkower 1952, nos. 4, 5, 7, 25–6, 66–9, 114–18. Other drawings that have been considered wrongly as studies for the Adoration of the Shepherds include Art Institute of Chicago, inv. 22.591 (Ostrow 1968, no. 1), by a later Guercinesque artist; Chicago, inv. 22.64 (Ostrow 1968, no. 2), a pastiche by a Genoese artist; and J. Paul Getty Museum, inv. 86.GA.736 (Goldner and Hendrix 1992, no. 12), which I believe to be by Annibale. 9 Lugt 1955, no. 2967; Teyler Museum, Haarlem, inv. k IX 7; Van Tuyl van Serooskerken 2000, no. 386.
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References
Wittkower 1952, no. 282; Bologna 1956, no. 146; Martin (J.R.) 1965, p. 177; Oxford 1996, under no. 78; Washington 1999, no. 29

Annibale Carracci’s frescoes in the Palazzo Farnese, Rome, were the defining projects of his life. His decoration of the Galleria (see no. 114) was the seminal work of the Baroque in the city, and broke him as an artist and a man. But before he began work in the Galleria he frescoed the adjoining Camerino, a relatively small room measuring 4.8 x 9.4 m (about 15 x 30 ft), probably Cardinal Odoardo Farnese’s study (fig. 137). The young Odoardo had begun negotiations to bring the Carracci to Rome in 1593. Agostino and Annibale travelled south to sign a contract the following year, and after returning to sort his affairs in Bologna, Annibale arrived in Rome, alone, in the autumn of 1595. Odoardo Farnese had first intended to have the Sala Grande of the palace frescoed with scenes from the life of his father, Alessandro, but this scheme was put in abeyance, and Annibale began work instead on the Camerino, completing that room by early 1597.

Odoardo Farnese had corresponded with his librarian, Fulvio Orsini, during the summer of 1595 about the decorative programme for the room. At the centre of the coved ceiling was a large rectangular canvas of the Choice of Hercules (now in Capodimonte, Naples), flanked on the long sides by two oval frescoes also on the theme of Hercules, and on the short sides by roundels with the Farnese emblem of lilies. The perimeter of the ceiling is punctuated by six triangular spandrels curving over lunettes, two on each long wall and one on each short wall; the lunettes depict scenes from the stories of Odysseus, Perseus, and the Catanian brothers.

The remainder of the vault is symmetrically divided by gilded stucco mouldings into a number of irregular fields, each frescoed with a monochrome arrangement of putti, sirens, satyrs, acanthus scrolls, masks, birds and decorative frameworks housing allegorical figures.¹

This full-scale cartoon corresponds in most respects with the putti flanking the figures of Chastity (above the lunette of Odysseus and Circe) and Intelligence (above Odysseus and the Sirens) in the triangular spandrels at either end of the room. However it is questionable whether the cartoon was actually used for transfer to the fresco surface: it does not correspond exactly with the paintings, in which the legs of the putto are longer, the frames are a simple oval (rather than the complex cartouche seen here), and the cornucopias interlock so that each putto grasps that of his neighbour.²

While the outlines of the cartoon are partly incised with a knife, some of these lines are of details that were not painted, primarily the cartouche. A contiguous cartoon for the siren in the same decorative field, also at Windsor (fig. 138), is likewise partially incised, again including the unpainted cartouche. That cartoon is joined to a fragment of another, for the heads of putti in the corners of the side-spandrels, which is pricked in great detail along its outlines. Close examination of the fresco itself would be required to resolve this complicated situation, but it would appear, whatever the scenario, that Annibale’s execution of the ceiling of the Camerino did not proceed in an orderly fashion, and that there was substantial revision of the scheme even as the artist was preparing the cartoons.

This cartoon and its companion were described by Vincenzo Vittoria in Carlo Maratti’s collection: ‘un pezzo di cartone di una sirena della nave di Ulisse, & un altro di un putto, che si vede negli ornamenti … tutti di Annibale.’³ The cartoon has thus been identified with that listed in the 1664 inventory of Domenichino’s heir, Francesco Raspantino, among many ‘Chartoni di mano del Caracci’, as a ‘Cartone d’un Putto con fogliami’, though as the companion piece of the siren does not seem to appear in that inventory some doubt remains about this identification.⁴

2. This observation was first made in Martin (J.R.) 1965, p. 177.
Annibale Carracci began the decoration of the Galleria Farnese in 1597, after completing work on the Camerino (see no. 113), and though his progress is not documented the date of 1600 painted below the scene of Polyphemus playing the pipes for Galatea presumably marks the conclusion of his work in the vault. Based on Michelangelo’s Sistine Chapel ceiling of ninety years before, Annibale’s orchestration of differing levels of representation and illusion set the standard for the ceiling designs of the next century. Fictive canvases in gilt frames seem to hang before a frieze of bronze medallions and stone herms, some of whom engage with the scenes they flank while betraying their marmoreal nature in chipped details or even missing limbs; in front of this sit nude youths supporting garlands of fruit and leering masks, and in the corners putti wrestle before an open sky. Yet the Galleria was not a mere work of frivolous virtuosity, for the mythological scenes were rigorously planned and stood alongside Raphael’s compositions as exemplars for the classicists of the seventeenth century.1

The present drawing is a study for the Cyclops in Polyphemus hurling the rock at Acis (fig. 139), the fictive painting ‘hanging’ in the curve of the vault at one end of the Galleria. Annibale posed a heavily muscled model holding a bundle of cloth or some other prop, and laid down the chalk lines rapidly in long, fine sweeps, the right shoulder distended to emphasise the weight of the rock. But the bulk is combined with perfect balance, the body pivoting around the axis of head and supporting leg, at the extreme of its motion before the release of its gathered force.

Annibale’s many able assistants absorbed his methods and propagated them assiduously in their subsequent careers, and it can be claimed that his studies for the Palazzo Farnese revived the art of life drawing in Rome. No previous artist had made such consistently large studies from the model. This expansiveness of form allowed Annibale to move beyond the conception of a painted figure as surface pattern, engaging fully with the sculptures of antiquity that now surrounded him – almost literally, for the Galleria was to house the cream of the Farnese collection of antique Roman statuary. And the sculptural influence was not one-way: Wittkower noted that Gian Lorenzo Bernini’s David of 1623 (Villa Borghese, Rome) betrays close study of Annibale’s figure of Polyphemus, particularly in the ‘physical concentration rendered at the split-second before release’.2

1 For the project see e.g. Martin (J.R.) 1965; Kliemann and Rohlmann 2004, pp. 452–75.
2 Wittkower 1955, p. 6.
A beggar c. 1610–15

Bartolomeo Schedoni spent his early life in the service of the Farnese in Parma, and his paintings and drawings show an interest in the art of the earlier generation of Correggio (nos. 34–5) and Anselmi (no. 41) as well as that of his contemporaries, most prominently the Carracci. Between 1602 and 1607 Schedoni worked at the court of Cesare d’Este in Modena, and from then until his early death in 1615 as court painter to Ranuccio Farnese in Parma. His more monumental and austere later works possibly demonstrate the impact of the return of Giovanni Lanfranco (no. 132) from Rome to Emilia in 1610.

The drawing had no traditional attribution and was catalogued by Blunt among the figure drawings of Lanfranco. It does, however, appear to be the work of Schedoni: while the majority of his few surviving drawings are in black chalk, the style and technique of this drawing are found in many of these sheets, with smoothly rubbed chalk brought into focus with sharp strokes of the wetted chalk, as seen for example in his drawings of the Madonna and Child in the Uffizi and at Chatsworth, and the Bust of a youth in Haarlem.

The implied scale of the figure and the supposition that he would have been an incidental figure rather than a protagonist suggest that this was a study for a major work. The drawing depicts a beggar, seated on low steps with indications of classical architecture beyond, his staff against his shoulder, holding out his hand to receive alms. The touch of discoloured white lead on the man’s eye is deliberate, presumably to indicate his blindness. Schedoni seems to have been drawn to such images, for beggars can be found in several of his paintings, though no figure in exactly this pose occurs in any surviving work. This type of half-naked figure seated in the lower corner of a composition was, however, much favoured by Schedoni, and pertinent comparisons can be seen in paintings such as the Holy Family Adored by Sts Pellegrino, John the Baptist, Laurence and Francis of Assisi in Naples (fig. 140), where heavy folds of drapery fall across the Baptist’s lap, his reed cross against his left shoulder; in the Young Baptist in the Wilderness (known in several versions); and in the St Peter and Workshop of St Joseph (both Naples, Palazzo Reale).

Fig. 140 Bartolomeo Schedoni, The Holy Family Adored by Sts Pellegrino, John the Baptist, Laurence and Francis of Assisi; oil on canvas, 298 x 179 cm (Museo di Capodimonte, Naples)

Provenance
Presumably Royal Collection by c.1810 (though not identified in Inv. A)

Reference
Blunt and Cooke 1960, no. 237

Bartolomeo Schedoni
Formigine, Emilia 1578 – Parma 1615

Red chalk
43.3 x 35.8 cm
BL 6115
DOMENICHINO (DOMENICO ZAMPIERI)
Bologna 1581–Naples 1641

116. St Jerome c.1612

Black and white chalks on blue paper
38.8 x 31.9 cm
RL 1732

PROVENANCE
Bequeathed by the artist to Francesco Raspantino; from whom purchased by Carlo Maratti, after 1664; from whom purchased by Clement XI, 1703; bequeathed to his nephew, Cardinal Alessandro Albani, 1721; from whom purchased by George III, 1762; Inv. A, p. 96, Domenichino Tom. XXXIV, 'A Study of St Jerome (in his celebrated picture)'

REFERENCES
Pope-Hennessy 1948, no. 1071; Roberts 1986, no. 88; Rome 1996, no. 58

The drawing is one of many surviving life studies for Domenichino’s most celebrated work, the Last Communion of St Jerome (fig. 141). The painting was set up on the high altar of San Girolamo della Carità, Rome, in September 1614, as part of a renovation of the church that had begun in 1610–11. After being removed to Paris during the Napoleonic occupation, the painting was returned not to its church, but to the Pinacoteca Vaticana, where it remains.

Domenichino received a first advance for the painting in August 1612. Earlier that year he seems to have returned briefly to Bologna, where he must have taken the opportunity to study Agostino Carracci's painting of this unusual subject (then in the Certosa, now in the Pinacoteca), and he found it hard to distance himself from Agostino's elegant arrangement. Though Domenichino reversed the direction of the composition and allowed more space between the figures, the structure of the composition is essentially the same. As a result he was (a decade later) accused of plagiarism by Giovanni Lanfranco, who to prove his point sent his pupil François Perrier to Bologna to make an etching after Agostino’s painting, for distribution in Rome. This accusation was prompted by the rivalry of the two artists, who were then competing for the commission for the decoration of Sant’Andrea della Valle (see no. 117); but while the accusation was not without substance, subsequent debate centred not on whether Domenichino had followed a distinguished model – which was entirely normal, even laudable – but on whether he had done it well.3

On his death Domenichino left the contents of his studio, including two thousand of his own drawings, to his pupil Francesco Raspantino. An inventory of 1664 lists the works then in Raspantino's collection; some time afterwards the bulk of the collection was acquired by Carlo Maratti, and from Maratti the drawings passed through the Albani collection to George III, for whom the 1,750 sheets by Domenichino were mounted in thirty-four albums.

Fig. 141 Domenichino, The Last Communion of St Jerome; oil on canvas, 419 x 256 cm (Pinacoteca Vaticana)

1 See e.g. Pope-Hennessy 1948, nos. 1064–96; Spear 1982, pp. 175–8; Cropper 1984; Washington 1986b, no. 148; Rome 1996, no. 20.
2 For the issue see Spear 1982, pp. 34–6; Cropper 1984a, p. 150; Cropper 1984b, pp. 120–8.
117. The Flagellation of St Andrew c. 1622–5

Provenance
As no. 116 (Inv. A, p. 87, *Domenichino Tom. VIII*, ‘3: Andrew stretch‘d on the Rack and tormented’)

References
Pope-Hennessy 1948, no. 790; Rome 1996, no. 72

This is a final working drawing for Domenichino’s fresco of the *Flagellation of St Andrew* (fig. 142), part of his decoration of the church of Sant’Andrea della Valle, his greatest fresco cycle in Rome. Domenichino painted the entire vault of the choir with scenes from the life of St Andrew, set within elaborate stucco frameworks designed by the artist; he also painted four huge figures of the Evangelists in the pendentives below Giovanni Lanfranco’s fresco of the *Assumption of the Virgin* on the inside of the dome.

The first payment to Domenichino was made in December 1622, for work in the choir. The building of the dome was completed in 1623, at which point Domenichino moved on to the pendentives, working on them during 1624 and 1625 before moving back to the choir, for which a final payment was made in February 1628. Lanfranco’s first payment was in August 1625, and it is possible that Domenichino was initially assigned the whole project, as claimed by Bellori and Baldinucci, and that only after the death in 1623 of Cardinal Alessandro Peretti Montalto, the main patron of the new church, did Lanfranco succeed in winning a portion of the commission. Passeri stated, on the contrary, that Lanfranco first held the commission before Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi persuaded Peretti Montalto to transfer it to Domenichino, and that the project was subsequently divided between the two artists, but this seems to be contradicted by the dates of the recorded payments.¹

The drawing is the culmination of Domenichino’s work on the composition of the *Flagellation*, as seen in another twenty sheets at Windsor. Having arrived at a satisfactory pose for each figure, he fitted them here into the framework of the architecture, then squared the sheet for enlargement to the full-size cartoon for the fresco. The painting occupies the upper left portion of the tribune, and (as indicated by the distorted ‘squaring’) is a complex shape, with the left half following the cylindrical curve of the barrel vault, and the right half the spherical curve of the semi-dome. (The equivalent space on the opposite side of the tribune was frescoed with *St Andrew Adoring the Cross of his Martyrdom*, and the central portion of the semi-dome with the *Calling of Sts Andrew and Peter.*) This irregular surface presented a problem in the consistent perspectival depiction of fictional space, which Domenichino solved by dividing the composition in two so that there is little spatial relationship between the scourging to the left and the onlookers to the right. There are few resemblances of detail between this composition and the artist’s fresco of the same subject in the Oratorio di Sant’Andrea of San Gregorio Magno, Rome, executed c. 1609, though he used the same simple organisational principles, with a bold architectural backdrop and the figures widely spaced in the uncluttered foreground.

The drawing is a study for an angel in the fresco of *St Dominic in Glory* (fig. 143), painted by Guido Reni (see no. 99) in the semi-dome of the chapel housing the saint's remains in the church of San Domenico, Bologna.1 It is close in detail to the figure in the fresco, and though drawn from a model, Reni added the outlines of the angel's wings in the upper corners of the sheet. The drapery in the fresco is much softer than in the drawing, where the strong faceting seems to have been a result of the hard, scratchy black chalk used for the study.

St Dominic died in Bologna in 1221 and was buried in the Dominican church of San Niccolò delle Vigne in that city. Rebuilding of the church began soon after, and it was re-dedicated to the saint following his canonisation in 1234. A tomb to house St Dominic’s remains was carved c. 1265 by Nicola Pisano, and was moved to the old south transept, converted into the chapel of St Dominic, in 1411. Later that century the lid of the sarcophagus was replaced with an elaborate pitched roof, with standing figures by Niccolò dell’Arca and Michelangelo. The chapel was remodelled between 1597 and 1605, whereupon the Dominicans sought to embellish the new large space.

In January 1610 Reni (in Rome) received 100 scudi on account for a painting for the chapel, probably intended for the side-walls, and the following month he bought canvas and strainers for this work (or works: one entry in his account book refers to ‘li quadri’). In December of that year Reni returned the advance to the Dominicans, a common occurrence as he was in the habit of accepting more work than he could execute.2 It seems that about the same time Alessandro Tiarini was commissioned to fresco the semi-dome of the chapel, and two of Tiarini’s compositional studies for the project survive;3 but Giovanni Luigi Valesio, with powerful supporters, succeeded in having Tiarini’s commission overturned in July 1611. Valesio was reluctantly allowed to execute the fresco, without payment and subject to the proviso that, should it not meet with approval, he would be liable for its removal. In January 1612 Valesio’s work was indeed found to be unsatisfactory, and the project to fresco the semi-dome ground to a halt.

When in 1612 or 1613 Reni returned from Rome to Bologna, having fallen out with his Borghese patrons, his earlier commission must have been cancelled and he was instead assigned the commission for the fresco in the semi-dome (the side paintings were executed by Mastelletta, Tiarini and Leonello Spada in 1613–16). A first payment was made to Reni in October 1613 but work stopped that December, when a plasterer was paid to consolidate (‘stabilir’) the work that Reni had done so far (presumably tidying up the ragged edges of the fresco’s *giornate*).4 The artist had been pressured into returning to Rome, where in 1614 he executed the famous *Aurora* in Palazzo Pallavicini. Even when work on that fresco had just begun, Reni was already thinking of quitting the city; in a letter to Cardinal Maffeo Barberini (later Pope Urban VIII) of 15 February 1614 he wrote of returning to Bologna ‘to finish the work begun in San Domenico’.5 He left Rome that autumn, resumed work on the fresco, and a final payment was made in June 1615.6

Malvasia recorded that on the unveiling of the fresco it was jealously criticised by Ludovico Carracci, Francesco Albani and Tiarini, who claimed that the figures were too large and their draperies too voluminous.7 Tiarini’s earlier drawings for the same site had featured much smaller figures, and the present drawing hints at the important role that the draperies were to play in Reni’s organisation of the composition. The clarity of the fresco recaptured something of the freshness of the Carracci’s early paintings, effectively rendering Ludovico’s later works (see no. 120) irrelevant for the future direction of the Bolognese school, and establishing Reni as the city’s leading painter.

---

1 Pepper 1984, no. 44.
2 For the entries in Reni’s account book see Pepper 1971, pp. 315–16, nos. 7, 54–6, 85.
3 Johnston 1996.
4 Alce 1958, p. 399.
5 Pollak 1913, p. 44.
6 Alce 1958, p. 399.
The head of Christ 1620

Red chalk
34.4 x 26.7 cm
71.5283

PROVENANCE
Silvestro Bonfiglioli (d. 1696); from whose heirs bought by Zaccaria Sagredo, 1728; from whom bought by Consul Joseph Smith, 1751/2; from whom bought by George III, 1762; Inv. A, p. 84, Teste di Cavedone, among '50. Although slight yet Drawn with great Fire and Spirit, most as large as Life

REFERENCES
Kurz 1955, no. 71; Blunt 1971, no. 384; Birke 1981, no. 836; Frankfurt 1988, no. 836

The drawing formed part of an album of fifty chalk heads by Reni's Bolognese contemporary Giacomo Cavedone (71.5244-93), and despite the differences of style and technique it was catalogued by Kurz as by Cavedone. Catherine Johnston subsequently identified the sheet as a study by Guido Reni for the Salvator Mundi, painted to Reni's designs by his assistant Francesco Gessi for the high altar of Santissimo Salvatore, Bologna. Payments to Reni for the painting are recorded between October and December 1620.1

Though the connection with Gessi's painting is not immediately striking, the identification is probably secure. The head is seen from below, though in the painting the effect of foreshortening is less strong and the gaze less imperious; the light falls from the same direction, and the edge of the Saviour's cloak is delineated here by the stroke of chalk to lower left. Negro suggested that the drawing was also used by Gessi for a painting of the Saviour with a Boy (private collection), though the tipped-back angle of the head is there even less marked.2

Malvasia mentioned the painting three times. In his biographies of both Reni and Gessi in Felsina Pittrice (1678) he recounted that, because Gessi had been slandering Reni, the master refused him payment for works that Gessi had painted for Reni before their departure for Naples in 1621, including the Saviour for Santissimo Salvatore;3 and in his later Piture di Bologna (1686) Malvasia explicitly mentioned the 'disegno, pastello della testa' by Guido from which Gessi had executed the painting.4 Malvasia probably knew the drawing at first hand, for it is to be identified with the 'Disegno con Testa del Salvatore mano di Guido in cornice dorata, e vetro' listed in the 1696 Bonfiglioli inventory; elsewhere Malvasia described as in the Bonfiglioli collection other drawings that are now at Windsor.5

A drawing in the Victoria and Albert Museum, of a bearded head in red and black chalks, has been mentioned in relation to the painting,6 but the resemblance is no more than coincidental and that drawing appears closer in style to Cavedone than to Reni.

1 Malaguzzi Valeri 1894, p. 369.
3 Malvasia 1678, ii, pp. 34, 347; 1980 edn, p. 76.
5 Pepper 1984, no. 8.12-2; Ward-Jackson 1980, ii, no. 790.
LUDOVICO CARRACCI
Bologna 1555–1619

120. *The Martyrdom of St Ursula c. 1614*

Pen and ink with grey and brown wash and white heightening over black chalk, on buff paper
48.9 × 38.6 cm, arched
RL 2346

PROVENANCE
Silvestro Bonfiglioli (d. 1696); from whose heirs bought by Zaccaria Sagredo, 1728; from whom bought by Consul Joseph Smith, 1751/2; from whom bought by George III, 1762; Inv. A, p. 77.
Caracci Tom. 11, among “4 for different Altarpieces painted at Bologna by L. & An: Caracci”

REFERENCES

Almost nothing is known about the origins of the story of St Ursula. The most common version of the legend relates that she was a Christian princess of the early Middle Ages from Britain, and betrothed to a pagan prince. Wishing to retain her virginity, she was allowed to postpone the wedding for three years, and she and ten companions, each with a thousand maidservants, set sail on a voyage. A gale drove the ships to Cologne, from where they made a pilgrimage to Rome; on their return to Cologne the eleven thousand virgins were slaughtered by the Huns for their faith.

Ludovico Carracci (for whom see no. 111) painted the *Martyrdom of St Ursula* three times, for the churches of Santi Leonardo e Orsola, Bologna, dated 1592 (now in the Pinacoteca); San Domenico, Imola, around 1600 (*in situ*); and Sant’Orsola, Mantua, around 1615 (lost). Bodmer and Wittkower catalogued this drawing as a study for the earliest of these paintings (which they thought was even earlier, as the date was revealed only when the painting was cleaned for exhibition in 1956), and an exemplar of what they characterised as Ludovico’s ‘early Mannerist’ style.1 Regardless of style, the arched format of the drawing (which does seem to be the artist’s decision, rather than the intervention of a later collector), and the conspicuous presence in the 1592 painting of a dead pope in the foreground and a bearded figure being received by the Virgin in the heavens above, argue against this identification. Though the spatial structure and iconography of the drawing are closer to the Imola painting, there has been no suggestion that the drawing is a study for that painting.

Mahon first proposed that the drawing was in fact preparatory for the latest of the three altarpieces (though we have no other record of the composition of that painting) and this view has generally been accepted.2 While the handling of underdrawing, pen and white are unusually spirited for late Ludovico, the spatial structure is unquestionably ‘late’ – a simplified layout, with a few large figures in a shallow foreground space, and a flat, heavily populated background at an indeterminate distance, as seen in several of Ludovico’s late altarpieces such as the *Martyrdom of St Margaret of 1616* (San Maurizio, Mantua), *Sts George and Catherine Prepared for Martyrdom of 1618–19* (Madonna della Ghiara, Reggio Emilia), and *San Bernardino Saving Carpi of 1619* (Notre-Dame, Paris). The decorative superficiality of the figures – male as well as female – is a far cry from the sculptural meatiness of Ludovico’s male nude for the Palazzo Fava of twenty-five years earlier (no. 111).

Like the *Martyrdom of St Margaret*, the lost Mantua painting of *St Ursula* was commissioned by Margherita Gonzaga (1564–1618), sister of Vincenzo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, and widow of Alfonso II d’Este of Ferrara. A letter from Ludovico to Margherita of 18 March 1615 requesting partial payment establishes that the work had been commissioned during the previous year and was then in progress. Ludovico’s delivery of the painting to Mantua is documented in a letter of 9 January 1616 from Andrea Barbazzi, the Gonzaga agent in Bologna, to the Duke, urging payment for the painting ‘nella chiesa di M[adre]na Ser[enissima] di Ferrara’, that is, the church patronised by the (dowager) Duchess of Ferrara. A further letter of 24 January from Giulio Moro, the Duchess’s treasurer, reported that the payment had been made.3 The painting was seen in place in 1768,4 but the convent closed in 1786 and the painting was transferred to the Accademia Virgiliana, from where it was sold in 1810. It has not been traced since.

1 Bodmer 1939, pp. 32, 128, 155; Wittkower 1952, no. 1.
3 For the documents see Luzio 1913, p. 128; A. Stanzani in the Italian edition of Bologna 1993, p. 257.
4 Candolfi 1768, p. 72.
San Carlo Borromeo interceding for the cessation of the plague c.1610–11

Pen and ink with brown and pink wash and white heightening
28.4 × 22.5 cm
K.5319

Provenance
Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 82, Francesco Albani, Carlo Cignani etc., ‘25. The miracle of the Cross, red paper washed with bistre’)

Reference
Kurz 1955, no. 625

Lorenzo Garbieri was one of the most faithful followers of Ludovico Carracci (nos. 111, 120) during the early seventeenth century. He took the dramatic elements of Ludovico’s style and exaggerated them, and his dense compositions are almost entirely articulated by heavy figures with inflated musculature. Malvasia noted in his biography of the artist that although Garbieri had the appearance and manners of a gentleman – well dressed, and skilled with the horse, the sword, and the lute – his preferred subjects were ‘horrid and lugubrious: massacres, deaths, martyrdoms, plagues, illnesses’. No works by Garbieri are known after the 1620s, and Malvasia stated that his career was cut short by an advantageous marriage and an eye condition that in time blinded him.1

The individual drawing styles of Ludovico’s many followers – such as Garbieri, Lucio Massari, Francesco Brizio, Francesco Gessi, and even Giacomo Cavedone – have remained poorly defined. This drawing is therefore important as a study for one of Garbieri’s certain works, his altarpiece of San Carlo Borromeo Interceding for the Cessation of the Plague in San Paolo Maggiore, Bologna (fig. 145).

Carlo Borromeo (1538–84) had been created a cardinal and Archbishop of Milan on the election of his uncle as Pope Pius IV in 1560, though he did not reside in Milan until 1565. During 1576 the plague struck the city, and disregarding his own well-being, Borromeo devoted himself to pastoral duties, at one point leading a penitential procession carrying a relic of the Holy Nail. It is this act of intercession that Garbieri has depicted. The layout of the final composition has been established, though in the painting Garbieri eliminated the background figures and angels to the left, and enlarged the remaining figures. Instead of praying before the cross, as here, in the painting Borromeo clutches it, and the Holy Nail is visible at the centre of the cross. To the right in the painting is one of the four ancient crosses that marked the boundaries of Bologna (now housed in San Petronio); Garbieri transplanted this to Milan to emphasise the processional nature of the intercession.

Borromeo was canonised on 1 November 1610, and shortly afterwards Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani commissioned Garbieri to execute a cycle of paintings on the life of the saint for a chapel in the Barnabite church of San Paolo, which was then being rebuilt.2 Giustiniani was the papal legate to Bologna from 1606 to 1611, and shortly afterwards Cardinal Benedetto was interested in Garbieri because of his preference for Caravaggesque style brought back to Bologna by artists who had recently visited Rome; Malvasia reported that he had made a copy of Caravaggio’s Doubting Thomas, then in the Lambertini collection in Bologna. Giustiniani and his brother, the Marchese Vincenzo, owned several works by Caravaggio, and it may have been that Benedetto was interested in Garbieri because of his preference for Caravaggesque lighting (though his mannered figure style was far from the realism of Caravaggio). According to Malvasia, Garbieri continued to execute paintings for Giustiniani after the Cardinal returned to Rome, though no works by the artist are identifiable in the posthumous inventory of Giustiniani’s collection.3

A drawing of the same subject in Düsseldorf was connected with Garbieri’s painting both by Budde and (hesitantly) by Schaar, but the connection seems to have been made solely on the basis of the subject matter.4 The style of the Düsseldorf drawing bears little resemblance to the present sheet; it has a curved upper left corner and must have been designed for a lunette, and Fischer Pace subsequently attributed it to the painter and engraver Carlo Cesii (1622–82).5

2 For the history of the church see Giordani 1851.
3 On Giustiniani see e.g. Danesi Squarzina 1997–8; Rome 2001; DBI, livii, 2001, pp. 315–25; Danesi Squarzina 2003.
4 Budde 1930, no. 603; Schaar 1969, no. 42.
Morazzone worked as a youth in Rome, where he acquired a distinctive style that combined a robustly Mannerist approach to composition, derived from Taddeo and Federico Zuccaro and their followers (nos. 22, 26–8), with quirky figures that owe something to the Sienese artists then active in the city. After his return to his native Lombardy around 1597, Morazzone’s first documented work was the decoration of the vault of the Cappella del Rosario in the basilica of San Vittore, Varese, which houses a miraculous fifteenth-century fresco of the Virgin and Child. In 1610 Morazzone painted an altarpiece of the Madonna of the Rosary for the chapel, later removed and now lost, and five years later he returned to the chapel once more to fresco the walls with a cycle of scenes of the early lives of the Virgin and of Christ.

The scenes, from the Chasing of Joachim from the Temple to the Dispute in the Temple, follow an iconographic programme devised by the provost of the chapel, Giovanni Andrea Dralli. The progress of the project is known in detail thanks to the contemporary chronicle of Giulio Tattoni and to documents published in 1927. Morazzone was assigned the commission in October 1615 and began work the same month. The two largest scenes, the Presentation of the Virgin and the Betrothal of the Virgin, were executed between July and September 1616, and Morazzone completed the cycle, after several interruptions, in November the following year.

The Presentation of the Virgin (fig. 146) is painted high on the right wall of the chapel, and thus Morazzone, like Paris Nogari in his painting in Santo Spirito, Rome (no. 28), gave the background architecture a strong perspectival slant and depicted the figures as if seen from below. The free use of white heightening belies the definitive status of the drawing, which is squared for transfer and agrees in almost all details with the painting as executed.

2 Stoppa 2003, pp. 228–9, with full earlier bibliography.
3 Tattoni 1954; Nicodemi 1927, p. 36.
RUTILIO MANETTI
Siena 1570–1639

123. The Ecstasy of St Gerard c. 1612–18

Brown, grey and white oil paint
38.0 × 26.4 cm
RL. 3498

PROVENANCE
Royal Collection by c. 1810 (Inv. A, p. 81, Guido &c. Tom. 6, among "24 Drawings of inferior Masters of the Bolognese School")

REFERENCES
Blunt 1971, no. 280; Bagnoli 1978b, no. 77

Manetti trained in Siena under the two leading painters in the city, Ventura Salimbeni and Francesco Vanni; as well as absorbing their style he was, as can be seen here, attracted to the figure types and compositions of Federico Barocci (cf. no. 52). A probable visit to Rome around 1620 radically reorientated Manetti’s style towards Caravaggism, and his formerly bright and open Tuscan paintings became claustrophobic and dramatically lit.

This is a study in monochrome oils – a technique frequently found in the oeuvres of Manetti’s masters – for what may have been one of his final paintings before the putative trip to Rome, a fresco of the Ecstasy of St Gerard in the Oratorio di Santi Ludovico e Gherardo, Siena (fig. 147). The scene fills one half of a lunette in the small oratory; the other half is taken up with Manetti’s fresco of St Gerard Healing a Possessed Man. In December 1612 the Compagnia di San Gherardo decided to commission a pair of frescoes of the miracles of St Gerard from Manetti, but work on these frescoes had still not begun by November 1618. At a meeting of the Compagnia in that month it was agreed that a certain Fortunato Vici and Sabatino Biondo were to meet the expense of the work, and Manetti presumably began work on the paintings soon after. His contribution, however, was limited to a single lunette. In 1635, Astolfo Petrazzi began further frescoes on the life of St Gerard in the oratory, and painted the altarpiece of the Miracle of the Corpse of St Ludovico; twelve years later Deifebo Burbarini completed the decoration with two more frescoes on the life of the saint.

1 Illustrated in Bagnoli 1978a, p. 35, fig. 18.

Fig. 147 Rutilio Manetti, The Ecstasy of St Gerard; fresco
(Oratorio di Santi Ludovico e Gherardo, Siena)
GUERCINO (GIOVANNI FRANCESCO BARBIERI)
Cento, Emilia 1591 – Bologna 1666

124. A recumbent male nude c. 1618–19

Oiled charcoal with some white chalk on buff paper, the corners made up 38.5 x 58.0 cm

PROVENANCE
Bequeathed to Benedetto and Cesare Gennari, the artist’s nephews; purchased from the Gennari family by Richard Dalton on behalf of George III, c. 1760;
Inv. A, p. 125, Opere Varie Tom. I, [p. 10] A large Academy figure by Guercino
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The dominant influences of Guercino’s first years were the works and methods of the Carracci in Bologna (nos. 88, 111–12), and between 1616 and 1618 he ran an academy of life drawing in a patron’s house in Cento, emulating the earlier Carracci academy in Bologna. The technique of oiled charcoal on toned paper was favoured by the Carracci’s contemporary and rival Pietro Faccini, whose drawings Guercino is reported as having admired. The stickiness of this medium prohibited fine detail and led to breadth of form and heavy shadows, perfectly attuned to Guercino’s rich early figural style.

The youth drawn here modelled often for Guercino around 1618 and appears in several of his drawings and paintings, notably Erminia discovering the wounded Tancred of c. 1618–19 (Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome) and St Sebastian Succoured of c. 1619 (fig. 148), in which the reclining poses of Tancred (facing the other way) and St Sebastian are similar to that here, without corresponding exactly. Three studies for the latter composition1 demonstrate that Guercino arrived at the final pose of St Sebastian in quick pen sketches, before presumably making a careful study from the life in the pose to be used in the painting. It is thus likely that the present sheet is not a rejected working study for that painting, but an independent life drawing, possibly executed in Guercino’s academy as a demonstration piece for his pupils.

Guercino was careful to preserve his drawings. On his death the thousands of sheets in his studio passed to his nephews, and by the mid-eighteenth century most had descended to Cesare’s grandson Carlo Gennari. Some were framed, a number were kept loose in portfolios, but the majority were mounted in albums, explaining the fine state of preservation of many of Guercino’s drawings. From the 1740s this inheritance began to be dispersed, and groups of drawings were sold to, among others, John Bouverie, William Kent, and Richard Dalton, Librarian to George, Prince of Wales, who purchased about forty drawings in 1758. This first tranche was followed by much larger (though undocumented) acquisitions for the Royal Collection, probably by Dalton on one or both of his return visits to Bologna in 1759 and 1763. George III ultimately owned around four hundred sheets by Guercino himself, two hundred by his assistants and another two hundred offsets of his chalk drawings, mounted in sixteen albums. The present sheet was not mounted among those, instead forming part of an album of unusually large drawings, but it is nonetheless likely that it shares the provenance of the bulk of Guercino’s drawings now at Windsor.

1 Turner (N.) 1991, p. 32.
2 In the Uffizi and at Windsor; Mahon 1968a, nos. 41–3.
The problem for Guercino was that the theatrical effect of watching the saint's body remains, the painting would have given the placement over the altar that housed her earthly remains centuries later. Her tomb in the catacomb of Domitilla Petronilla took to fasting and prayer and soon died. Her body in the catacomb was transferred to St Peter's. St Petronilla, who died around AD 100, but nothing is known of the historical details of the saint. A legend grew that she was a daughter of St Peter, and was betrothed to a pagan nobleman called Flaccus. Unwilling to enter the marriage, Petronilla took to fasting and prayer and soon died. Her tomb in the catacomb of Domitilla was venerated from an early date, and in the fourth century a basilica was erected on the site to house her remains and those of Sts Nereus and Achilleus. In the eighth century she was named protectress of the Frankish kings, and her sarcophagus was transferred to St Peter's. After the rebuilding of St Peter's in the sixteenth century her remains were placed, in 1606, in an altar to the right of the tribune of the basilica. Guercino received the commission to paint the altarpiece— the only one for St Peter's to be commissioned by Gregory XV—in December 1621, and delivered the work in May 1623, shortly before the Pope's death. In 1730 it was replaced with a mosaic copy by Pietro Paolo Cristofari, and the painting is now in the Capitoline picture gallery.

The unusual subject of the burial of the saint may have been chosen because no dramatic episodes of her life were known. Placed over the altar that housed her earthly remains, the painting would have given the theatrical effect of watching the saint's body being lowered down to her final resting place. The problem for Guercino was that this inevitably concentrated attention at the bottom of the enormous canvas, over 7 m (24 ft) high, and he had to devise a composition that adequately filled the pictorial field.

In Guercino's early compositional drawings he experimented with different moments of the burial. Studies in the Courtauld Institute and at Windsor show only a lamentation over the body of the saint, while another sketch at Windsor shows her body being lifted from its bier. In the present study the saint's body is being moved towards the open grave; what appears to be a cross at centre left is the bier being carried away from the scene. The richly dressed young man on a horse has been plausibly identified as Flaccus, the bearded labourer who points to the saint implausibly as St Peter. The background architecture shows that Guercino was aware of the need to articulate the picture surface with massive elements, though the space implied by the receding wall at centre left is poorly defined and the figures are seen from inconsistent angles, a consequence of combining several separate studies in this one sheet.

Given the great importance of the site, it is very likely that the young artist was required to prepare this modello for the examination of his patrons. Indeed, this is the only extant large modello for a painting by Guercino, and he attempted to capture something of the effect of the intended painting by rubbing the black chalk to model and shade the figures. But whether it was the Pope (or his proxy) or the artist who was dissatisfied with this composition, it was to be wholly reworked, and only Christ resembles the equivalent figure in the painting.

A subsequent drawing in Copenhagen shows the saint being lowered into the grave, and attempts to solve the spatial confusion by organising the figures into receding planes. But the great height of the altarpiece would remain a problem: although the figures here and in the Copenhagen study would be life-size if scaled up to the canvas, there would remain large areas of dead space at the centre of the painting. Guercino therefore radically enlarged the foreground figures in the painting, further clarifying the spatial structure. The rigorous approach to pictorial space in the painting has been seen as crucial to the development of Guercino's increasingly classicising style in the 1620s.
FRANCESCO BORROMINI
Bisone, Ticino 1599 – Rome 1667

126. A design for a twisted column c.1625

Pen and ink with wash, over traces of black chalk or graphite and much pinpointing, on discoloured paper
49.6 × 21.4 cm
RL 5635

PROVENANCE
Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 114, Giovanni Lorenzo Bernini Tom. II, among '9. Of Ornaments in Architecture')
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Having trained as a mason in Milan, Borromini moved to Rome in 1619. He was distantly related to Carlo Maderno (1555/6–1629), at that time in charge of the completion of St Peter’s, and was thus able to find work on that project, quickly establishing himself as principal assistant to Maderno and producing finished working drawings from his master’s indications. In 1624 Borromini was assigned to work with Gian Lorenzo Bernini (nos. 136–7) on the St Peter’s baldacchino, and soon emerged as one of the leading figures of the Roman Baroque. His subsequent architectural projects – including San Carlo alle Quattro Fontane, San Filippo Neri, Sant’Ivo della Sapienza and the Collegio di Propaganda Fide – reveal a fundamentally different approach to architecture from that of Bernini, more interested in abstract geometry than in scenographic effects.

Shortly after the election of Maffeo Barberini as Urban VIII in 1623, the Pope commissioned the 25-year-old Bernini to construct a huge canopy in part-gilded bronze over the tomb of St Peter, at the central point of the basilica (fig. 150). Baldacchino usually consisted of four sculptures of angels or other figures bearing poles from which was slung a canopy of precious cloth, simulating the sunscreens that were carried over important personages in processions. Temporary baldacchini had been placed over the tomb of St Peter from an early stage in the reconstruction of the basilica. In 1606 a wooden baldacchino was erected to Maderno’s designs, and in 1624 the angels of that structure were replaced with larger stucco figures by Bernini. But that seems to have been intended as a temporary arrangement, for around the same time Bernini began work on the design of the new bronze baldacchino.

Bernini recognised that any baldacchino supported by figures would be hopelessly lost in the cavernous spaces of St Peter’s, unless the figures were absurdly large. To match the new baldacchino to the vast interior he raised the canopy on four enormous columns, topped with an entablature, upon which stand angels supporting the canopy from decorative rope-like swags, the whole standing 28 m (92 ft) high. The twisted columns echo the form of ancient columns from the old basilica, thought at the time to have been brought by the Emperor Constantine from the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem (hence the description of such twisted columns as ‘Solomonic’).

By late 1624 attempts were being made to gather surplus bronze from the construction of the dome of St Peter’s, though it was thought necessary to supplement this with antique bronze pillaged from the portico of the Pantheon (giving rise to the anonymous epigram ‘Quod non fecerunt barbari fecerunt Barberini’ – ‘What the barbarians didn’t do, the Barberini have done’). The foundations were begun in the spring of 1625; by September 1626 the columns had been cast in three sections, and they were erected during the summer of 1627. At that stage the form of the canopy itself had still not been decided. Bernini’s initial design culminated in a statue of the Risen Christ, and a wood and papier mâché mock-up of this design stood in place until 1631, when it was replaced by another featuring volutes rising on the diagonals to a gilded globe surmounted by the Cross. This version was cast in 1632, and work was complete by the following year.

This drawing studies the upper section of the right-hand columns (the columns twist in opposite directions on either side of the baldacchino), and corresponds closely with the design as cast. The capital is composite, with egg-and-dart moulding between the Ionic volutes, and a tiny sun – one of the emblems of the Barberini – placed on the abacus above it. Branches of laurel, another Barberini emblem, follow the spiral of the shaft, interspersed with putti and Barberini bees, and with a collar of acanthus leaves at the base of the section.

As with two drawings at Windsor for the entablature of the baldacchino, this sheet is carefully measured out with many pinpricks, and is drawn with a sharpness familiar from many of Borromini’s architectural drawings. It is plainly a working drawing, but the role of Borromini in the project remains problematic. While it is accepted that Bernini was responsible for the overall concept of the baldacchino, his few surviving studies for the project are sketches, and he was clearly exaggerating when he claimed that he had himself ‘made the designs and the small and large models, that he had made the plaster moulds and cast the wax, that he had cleaned the wax casts and fitted them together to cast the metal, that he had attached the tubes for the metal to enter and for the air to escape’, playing down the role of the master bronze founders who had been

Fig. 150 After Gian Lorenzo Bernini, The Baldacchino; engraving (Royal Library, Windsor, RCIN 1150649, CE)
recruited to cast the huge sections. Borromini had presumably been enlisted in the project for his architectural expertise, for at that stage of his career Bernini’s own architectural experience was minimal. This drawing may have been prepared by Borromini on the basis of Bernini’s sketches for the approval of the Pope, and to serve as a model for the craftsmen who were constructing the moulds for the casting.

The drawing comes from one of two volumes devoted to Bernini in George III’s library, together containing over a hundred drawings. Their earlier history is unknown, though it is likely that most came to the King with the Albani collection. They must have been treasured from an early date, for many (including this sheet) bear the signs of having been displayed for long periods, with discoloured paper, faded washes and insect damage, and several have been skilfully restored, apparently around 1700.

3 Payments to Borromini for drawings for the project are recorded between 1631 and 1633, on which basis Randolfi (in Lugano 1999, no. 223) dated this drawing to those years; but such a sheet would have served no practical purpose five years after the relevant component had been cast.
PIETRO DA CORTONA (PIETRO BERRETTINI)
Cortona 1596 – Rome 1669

127. A design for a Quarantore c. 1632 – 3

Pen and ink with wash over black chalk
39.8 × 56.8 cm
Rf 4448
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Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 112, Pietro Berretino da Cortona Tom. II, among ‘20 Martial and Religious or Popish Devices mix’d ... Ornaments for insides of Churches, Pallaces, and other Devices’)
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Pietro Berrettini was born in the southern Tuscan town of Cortona, and received a haphazard training with a number of late Mannerist painters before moving to Rome as a young man and receiving his first full exposure to the classical tradition. From the mid-1620s he enjoyed the patronage of the nephew of Pope Urban VIII, Cardinal Francesco Barberini, for whom he worked on a series of projects culminating in the huge ceiling fresco of the Galilei in the Palazzo Barberini, perhaps the most accomplished painting of the Roman Baroque. Cortona spent much of the 1640s in Florence, completing a series of ceiling paintings among elaborate stucco decorations in the Palazzo Pitti, before returning to Rome, where the major works of his later career were the frescoes in the Chiesa Nuova. He also practised as an architect intermittently throughout his career, his masterpiece being the church of the Accademia, Santi Luca e Martina.

This design is for the decorations for the Quarantore celebrated in February 1633 in the church of San Lorenzo in Damaso, Rome. The Quarantore, or Forty Hours’ Devotion, originated in the medieval tradition of placing the consecrated host in a symbolic tomb (the Easter Sepulchre) between Good Friday and Easter Sunday, forty hours being the time spent by Christ in the tomb. In the sixteenth century, beginning in Milan, this was transformed into successive periods of forty hours’ continuous prayer, passing from church to church and so establishing a perpetual devotion within the city. The altar was often decorated with a temporary structure or apparato to focus attention on the (physically small) host.

From the end of the sixteenth century it became usual in Rome to hold the Quarantore for nine days during February, successively in the churches of the Congregazione della Comunione Generale, San Lorenzo in Damaso and the Gesù, to divert the populace from the debaucheries of the carnival. San Lorenzo in Damaso was the titular church of the Vice-Chancellor, attached to his residence, the Cancelleria; and when Francesco Barberini was appointed Vice-Chancellor in November 1632 on the death of Ludovico Ludovisi (nephew of the previous pope, Gregory XV), he immediately aimed to outdo Ludovisi’s highly praised Quarantore of 1631. Barberini commissioned Pietro da Cortona to transform the interior of the church, obscuring its permanent architecture to create an all-enveloping setting for the meditation on the host.

The decorations were described in a contemporary account:

On Thursday morning, in the church of San Lorenzo in Damaso, the oration of the Quarantore was celebrated, with an apparato that the most eminent Cardinal Barberini (Vice Chancellor and new titular of that church) had had most superbly made, in the form of a theatre with columns, niches, and gilded statues of saints with other ornaments; representing (on the high altar) the rays of the sun, in the middle of which was placed the Holy Sacrament supported by two huge angels, with a great quantity of candles in silver candlesticks on the said apparato, and with silver candelabra and continuous sermons and music, etc.¹

This drawing shows the view down the length of the church. A screen closed off the side aisles and reduced the form of the church to an oratory. At the mid-point of the nave, pedestals supported free columns, flanked by niches containing the statues of saints, above which ran an entablature and an attic storey with candelabra and vases. The form of the clerestory is barely indicated, but seems to consist of low pilasters. The altar was surrounded by clustered columns supporting a triumphal arch, in front of which hung painted clouds. At the centre of the arch was the host itself, displayed in a monstrosity supported by airborne angels, set against a backdrop of a sunburst with cherubs and clouds. The apparato was equipped with only a few visible candles (limited in number by an encyclical of 1592 that attempted to restrict the extravagance of the event), but was illuminated by countless other candles and lamps hidden by the architectural elements.

Nothing survives of the many ephemeral apparati that were such a feature of ceremonial in seventeenth-century Rome; they are known only through descriptions, drawings such as this, and engravings that were made to record them. Such apparati were little different in concept from stage scenery. Cortona had already designed the stage set for the first performance, in Palazzo Barberini in 1632, of the opera Sant’Alessio (the libretto by Giulio Rospigliosi, the future Pope Clement IX, and the music by Stefano Landi, who also composed the music for the 1633 Quarantore). He received the commission to design the apparato for San Lorenzo in Damaso in December 1632, giving him less than two months to design and supervise its construction. The little time available, and the fact that the structure was intended to be temporary, meant that the decorations were constructed of inexpensive and quickly worked materials – the architecture of wood (painted in imitation of marble), the sculpture of papier mâché or stucco (again painted or gilded), the paintings in quick-drying tempera on thin canvas or linen. Nonetheless, this was to be the most costly Quarantore apparato ever built, and Cortona’s design was so successful that it was used for the celebrations in San Lorenzo each year for the next fifteen years.²

¹ Quoted in Pollak 1928–31, i, p. 165.
Poussin was born in Normandy but travelled to Italy at around the age of 30 and, except for a short and disaffected return to Paris in 1640–41, he spent the rest of his life in Rome. His paintings, mostly executed for erudite private collectors and replete with scholarly references, were instrumental in the development of seventeenth-century classicism, especially in his home country where his work was avidly collected.

The drawings on the two sides of this sheet are preparatory for a painting of the Saving of the Infant Pyrrhus in the Louvre (fig. 151). As an infant, Pyrrhus was carried to safety when his father, King Aeacides, was driven from Epirus. Arriving at Megara at nightfall, his protectors found the river outside the city impassable; with the enemy in close pursuit, they threw across messages attached to a stone and a spear, and the Megarans sent a boat to rescue the child (Plutarch, Life of Pyrrhus, Book 2).

The painting is first noted in the collection of Gian Maria Roscioli (1609–44), who recorded the payment of 70 scudi for ‘un quatro alto pmi 4½ largo pmi 6½ con l’istoria del Ré Pirro mano di Monsù Posino’ in his account book on 2 September 1634. Roscioli served as an attendant to Pope Urban VIII, and shortly before his early death was appointed a papal secretary; he was thus a member of the Barberini circle (including Cassiano dal Pozzo), Poussin’s principal patrons. The account does not state whether the payment was directly to Poussin, and Roscioli might have been buying the painting second-hand, but the styles of both drawing and painting do not allow a date much before 1634. In May 1635 Roscioli spent a further 12 scudi on gilding the frame of the painting and of another by Claude, perhaps suggesting that he had acquired them unframed, directly from the artists’ studios.

Poussin’s reputation as a cold classicist is belied by the extreme emotion of the figures and the agitated drawing style. The long-limbed figures are constructed with bold strokes of the pen, and the rich wash, which covers most of the drawing’s surface, articulates the composition with strong rhythmic contrasts. The dark and stormy background is an almost uniform layer of wash, with ragged fringes of white paper silhouetting the trees and buildings against the light of the setting sun. Nonetheless, the composition remains resolutely formal, the principal figures arranged as a frieze before a classical landscape. The painting follows the drawing in its general layout, but there are many differences of detail, most notably the introduction in the painting of a skirmish at far right, as Pyrrhus’s defenders fight off the pursuing Molossians.

The poses of the two message-throwers are derived from drawings added by Poussin to a manuscript of Leonardo da Vinci’s Treatise on Painting, copied for Cassiano dal Pozzo (see nos. 129–30) from a version in the Barberini library. It was presumably only the enthusiasm of Cassiano that led Poussin to become involved in that project—the artist himself had little time for Leonardo’s treatise, claiming that ‘all that is of value in that book could be written on one sheet of paper in large letters’.

1 Barroera 1979, p. 70; Corradini 1979.
THE ‘CODEX URSINIANUS COPYIST’
fl. Rome c.1625

129. **A Roman banquet c.1625**

Pen and ink with wash over black chalk, on two sheets of paper
39.5 × 113.4 cm
RL 8434
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Comissioned by Cassiano del Pozzo; by descent to Cosimo Antonio dal Pozzo; from whom purchased by Clement XI, 1703; bequeathed to his nephew, Cardinal Alessandro Albani, 1714; from whom purchased by George III, 1762; Inv. A, p. 138, among ‘Nine Volumes lettered “Bassi rilievi antichi”’
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This and the following drawing come from the collection of Cassiano dal Pozzo (1588–1657), one of the great figures of seventeenth-century Rome. His collection was notable not for its magnificence (though he was Poussin’s most important patron) but for its range. Lacking the financial resources of the princes and cardinals of the age – among them his employer, Cardinal Francesco Barberini – Cassiano instead commissioned and collected many thousands of prints and drawings to form a visual encyclopedia or ‘Paper Museum’, principally of antiquities, architecture and natural history.

Over several decades Cassiano engaged artists to make drawings of sarcophagi and other sculpture, archaeological remains, ancient buildings and inscriptions. Many of these were done directly from the objects, but a number were copied from sixteenth-century sources. This large drawing was one of many copied by a single unidentified hand from the Codex Ursinianus,1 a manuscript bequeathed to the Vatican library by Fulvio Orsini (cf. no. 113) on his death in 1600, which itself included many copies after drawings by the artist and antiquary Pirro Ligorio (1513–83).2

The subject of the *triclinium* or Roman dining room exerted a fascination over the antiquarians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, many of whom were, like Cassiano, as interested in the circumstances of daily life as in the great
events of the period. Cassiano himself owned no fewer than thirty-two drawings of the subject, including a second drawing copied after another sheet in the Codex Ursinianus.³

When the entourage of Cardinal Barberini passed through Provence in April 1625 on a diplomatic mission to the French court, Cassiano met the scholar Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc for the first time. Cassiano left Peiresc with three antiquarian drawings, which Peiresc described in a letter to Peter Paul Rubens on 1 May 1625. Two of the drawings depicted ancient actors' masks; the third showed ‘a great formal banquet of thirty-six reclining diners with their attendants and other servants depicted in the antique manner; the invention, it is believed, of Pirro Ligorio on the advice of [Onofrio] Panvinio or of Fulvio Orsini’. ⁴ The present sheet is presumably a second copy, done for Cassiano’s own collection at the same time as that for Peiresc.

The identity of many of the draughtsmen who worked for Cassiano is unknown. They were on the whole minor figures who would have been expected to suppress their personal styles for the sake of archaeological accuracy, and only a few names have come to light. Turner attributed the present drawing to the obscure Sienese artist Bernardino Capitelli;⁵ however, Capitelli was introduced to Cassiano only in March 1626, and if this drawing was made at the same time and by the same hand as that presented to Peiresc in 1625 — which cannot be confirmed, as Peiresc’s copy is lost, but seems a reasonable supposition — then Capitelli’s authorship is unlikely.

¹ Vatican Library, MS Lat. 3439, fol. 101v, 42.5 × 111 cm.
³ R.v. 8433, copied after Codex Ursinianus, f.106v.
Vincenzo Leonardi
fl. Rome c.1621–1646

130. A Roman steelyard balance (statera) c.1630–40

Watercolour and bodycolour over black chalk
and pen and ink
40.8 x 126.0 cm
RL 11186

Provenance
As no. 129; Inv. A, p. 137, in 'A Volume containing Drawings of Roman Antiquities – Vases – Candelabra – Mosaics &c on 220 pages lettered “Disegni d’varie Antichità”'
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Like no. 129, the drawing formed part of Cassiano dal Pozzo’s ‘Paper Museum’, and it too demonstrates the interest of seventeenth-century antiquarians in Roman daily life (of which ancient systems of weight and measure were a particular fascination). It depicts, at actual size, a bronze statera or steelyard balance for weighing large quantities of meat, sacks of produce and so on. The object to be weighed was suspended from the hooks shown along the top of the drawing and hung from the left end of the balance. One of three different fulcra was chosen, depending on the weight of the object; the counterweight, in the form of a bust of Minerva, was moved down the arm of the steelyard to achieve a balance. The weight of the object was then read off a scale marked on the relevant face of the arm. Because of the different fulcra, this apparatus allowed a wide range of weights to be measured quickly and accurately, and steelyards are still in use across the world. Many survive from antiquity,
though – somewhat surprisingly – this particularly impressive example has not been identified.

While many of the drawings in the Paper Museum cannot be attributed to individual artists, a large group of elaborate sheets seem to be by Vincenzo Leonardi, who worked for Cassiano from at least 1621 until 1646. Most of these are of natural history subjects, and use a sophisticated layering of watercolour and bodycolour. Though the subject matter here is unusual for Leonardi, the style and technique of the drawing are his, and the sheet may be attributed to him with some confidence.

The drawing was the first illustration in Francis Haskell’s introduction to the first publication emanating from the Dal Pozzo Project, which aims to catalogue in over thirty volumes all of the surviving Paper Museum.¹

¹ Haskell 1989a, p. 2.
Andrew Sacchi
?Rome 1599 – Rome 1661

131. The Three Magdalenes c.1632 – 3

Red chalk, partly washed over
42.9 × 30.0 cm, arched
Inscribed lower right, pen: And.a Sacchi
RL 4349
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Andrew Sacchi formed a link between the Roman classicism of the start and the end of the seventeenth century. He was trained with Francesco Albani, the pupil and assistant of Annibale Carracci (nos. 113–14), and he was in turn the master of Carlo Maratti (nos. 149–50). His openly expressed opposition to the aesthetic of Pietro da Cortona marked him out, along with Nicolas Poussin, as one of the most important representatives of a more sober Baroque style. As a young man he was patronised by Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte, executing paintings for St Peter’s by 1625 and thereby coming to the attention of the Sacchetti and Barberini families, for whom many of Sacchi’s mature works were commissioned.

A painting of St Mary Magdalene, the Blessed Mary Magdalene de’ Pazzi, and Mary Magdalene, ‘Queen of India or China’, seated among clouds, was described by Bellori in his manuscript life of Sacchi as among the works painted for Cardinal Antonio Barberini.1 Roberto Longhi first related this description to an altarpiece then in San Salvi, Florence and now in the Uffizi (fig. 153), with a smaller version of the same composition in Palazzo Corsini, Rome.2

Mary Magdalene de’ Pazzi (1566–1607) had been a nun at the Carmelite convent of Santa Maria degli Angeli in Florence. She was beatified by Urban VIII in 1626, after which the Carmelites – among whom were two nieces of the Pope – obtained permission to establish a convent dedicated to her, on the site of a monastery at Borgo Pinti. Building work was paid for by the Pope, his sister-in-law Donna Costanza, and his nephew Cardinal Francesco Barberini. Among other gifts to the convent, in January 1634 the Pope, in gratitude for the finger of the Blessed [Mary Magdalene de’ Pazzi] that he had received, sent them a silver cross with a fragment of the wood of the True Cross. The cross was supported by two angels, with a silver base on an ebony pedestal, and, at the sides, relics of the Penitent St Mary Magdalene and of the Blessed Mary Magdalene, martyr of Japan, with a small empty oval left for a relic of St Mary Magdalene dei Pazzi. He also sent them a large painting in which was depicted the three aforementioned saints.3

It is probable that the painting sent to Florence in 1634 was that now in the Uffizi. From early inventories it seems that Sacchi executed a second large version for Cardinal Antonio Barberini’s own collection, which Bellori knew and which is recorded in Rome from around 1645 to 1850 (after which it disappears). The Florence version is not mentioned in any early guidebooks and may have been placed in the closed part of the convent, though an apparently derivative painting of the three saints by Livio Mehus suggests that Sacchi’s altarpiece was known to Florentine artists.4 The identity of St Mary Magdalene of Japan, India or China (depending on the reference) has not been established; Sutherland Harris noted that in the painting ‘she holds glowing coals, and was presumably roasted to death, but all the seven Mary Magdalenes martyred in Japan before 1633 were crucified or beheaded’.5

The basic layout of the composition is established here, but there are many differences between drawing and painting, most notably the presence in the drawing of three river-gods in an indeterminate landscape, and the more spacious composition, akin to Sacchi’s Allegory of Divine Wisdom of c.1630 in Palazzo Barberini. In the final composition the landscape was eliminated, and the figures increased in scale to fill much of the picture surface.

1 Bellori 1942 edn, p. 67.
2 For a full account of the paintings see Sutherland Harris 1977a, pp. 67–9; Nettuno 1999, pp. 60–62 (the plate reversed).
3 Richa 1754–62, i, p. 325, quoted in Sutherland Harris 1977a, p. 68. For Barberini patronage of the convent see Pacini 1988.
4 Florence 1986b, no. 96.
5 Sutherland Harris 1977a, p. 68. For Barberini patronage of the convent see Pacini 1988.
6 Sutherland Harris and Schaar 1967, nos. 39–49.
GIOVANNI LANFRANCO
Parma 1582 – Rome 1647

132. The Martyrdom of St Thomas (?) c. 1640

Black chalk, pen and ink, and wash, on several pieces of paper
35.4 × 23.3 cm
Inscribed along top edge (cut): di Lanfranco
KL 5874

PROVENANCE
Probably Carlo Maratti (see no. 150); from whom purchased by Clement XI, 1703; bequeathed to his nephew, Cardinal Alessandro Albani, 1721; from whom purchased by George III, 1762; Inv. A, p. 84, Lanfranco, among '54 Study's for various paintings, not above three or four small Compositions in the whole Volume'

REFERENCE
Blunt and Cooke 1960, no. 194

As a young man Lanfranco studied in Parma under Agostino Carracci, travelling to Rome on Agostino’s death to join Annibale Carracci’s workshop, alongside Domenichino. Following Annibale’s death, Lanfranco spent a couple of years back in Emilia before returning to Rome in 1612, where he became Domenichino’s great rival (see nos. 116–17). In 1614 he moved to Naples, painting fresco cycles in the cupola of the Gesù Nuovo, the Certosa di San Martino, the Cappella del Tesoro of the cathedral, the Duomo at Pozzuoli, and much of the interior of the large church of Santi Apostoli.

The rebuilding of Santi Apostoli began in 1610, and the church was substantially complete by 1633 (though it was not formally consecrated until 1649, and the construction of the dome was not begun until 1664; see no. 148). Lanfranco began work on the frescoes of the interior in 1638, starting in the choir and crossing, and moving on to the nave between 1640 and 1644. Financial difficulties on the part of the patrons seem then to have suspended work for two years until Lanfranco was able to complete the project in 1646.1

This complex drawing is a study for what is probably the Martyrdom of St Thomas, in the right half of the lunette over the west door – the identifications of the various martyrdoms were confused from an early date, and this scene has more often been called the Martyrdom of St Matthew.2 Scores of drawings for Lanfranco’s work in Santi Apostoli survive, mainly in Naples,3 and we can follow his development of this composition in some detail.

The scene was initially intended to fill the left part of a lunette. In the Uffizi is a rapid sketch for the saint surrounded by his assassins.4 This lower portion of the composition was more fully worked up in a sheet in New York,5 in which the left corner is taken up with a seated figure watching the martyrdom.

The present drawing is a collage of several different pieces of paper. At centre left Lanfranco pasted on a revision to the figure standing over the head of the saint, and at lower left he added a figure fleeing in terror (studied individually elsewhere).6 The artist drew a squared grid over the composition, then cut the sheet irregularly in half and repositioned the two portions a little closer together, misaligning the grid. At this stage, Lanfranco made the decision to move the position of the scene within the church, and with chalk additions he modified the upper part of the drawing to fit the composition instead to the right side of a lunette. He then redrew the composition in a rapid pen sketch now in Capodimonte,7 and finally clarified the upper part in a careful chalk drawing also in Naples.8

2 For the identification of this scene see Schleier 1983, pp. 204–5.
3 See Naples 1964.
4 Schleier 1983, no. xlIh.
5 Bean 1979, no. 259.
6 In the Uffizi (Schleier 1983, no. xliId) and the Metropolitan Museum (Bean 1979, no. 260).
7 Naples 1964, no. 64; repr. Enggass 1964b, fig. 38.
8 Naples 1964, no. 63, pl. 13.
PIETRO TESTA
Lucca 1612 – Rome 1650

133. Midas c. 1640–50

Pen and ink over traces of black chalk
20.8 × 27.2 cm
Inscribed by the artist, lower right: quel’Mida che / tanto ne tiraneggia;
at upper left: che coglionerie vi scrivo

PROVENANCE
Royal Collection by c. 1810 (Inv. A, p. 127, Pietro Testa, Solimena &c, among ‘20 Various Compositions drawn with a Pen by Pietro Testa, many of them etched by himself’)

REFERENCES
Blunt and Cooke 1960, no. 983; Cropper 1988, no. 99; London 2002, no. 371

Pietro Testa had settled in Rome by the late 1620s, working at first in the studios of Domenichino (nos. 116–17) and Pietro da Cortona (no. 127), though he retained links with his native Lucca throughout his life. Like Nicolas Poussin (no. 128) he entered the circle of Cassiano dal Pozzo (see nos. 129–30), for whom he reportedly prepared many drawings after the antique, the identification of which, however, remains controversial. Unlike Poussin, he was more a natural draughtsman (and etcher) than a painter, but it was to the status of a great public painter that he aspired, and a succession of frustrated projects and strained relationships led to his presumed suicide by drowning in the Tiber.

This sheet is a fine illustration both of Testa’s pungent pen style and of his difficult dealings with his patrons. It formed part of a draft letter to Niccolò Simonelli, a collector whom he had known since at least 1636; the remainder of the letter is on a separate sheet also at Windsor. The tone of the letter is rather mercurial and a little bewildering. Testa seems to accuse Simonelli of trying to buy off their relationship, whereas Testa had thought that through the few ‘bagatelles’ already executed for Simonelli he could ‘build a wall of benevolence’ and ‘enjoy the sweetness of a most precious and, by me, always-desired friendship’. He goes on to explain that in the drawing he had converted an ancient fable to modern usage: Midas was the King of Phrygia who was granted a wish that all he touched would turn to gold, but he soon began to starve when his food was likewise transformed. Testa takes this to symbolise the tyranny of those for whom that which should nourish (friendship) is turned not to virtue but to gold (or seen in terms of money). But the draft ends in jovial mood: ‘Who knows if I, too, will not one day with my pencil go to Parnassus? You see what bollocks [coglionerie] I write to you.’

In Stuttgart is a crude tracing of the drawing by Testa himself, inscribed with a version of part of the last paragraph of the Windsor letter.¹

¹ Cropper 1988, no. 100.
**PIER FRANCESCO MOLA**
Coldrerio, Ticino 1612 – Rome 1666

134. *Bacchus and Ariadne c. 1647–8*

Pen and ink, brush and ink, brown wash, over red and black chalk
20.0 × 26.1 cm
Inscribed on the old mount, pencil: *F. MOLA DIPINSE DEL PALAZZO COSTGUTI*
RL 6799

**PROVENANCE**
Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 128, *Moderna Schuola Romana Tom. III*, “The last drawing but one is of Mola”)

**REFERENCES**
Blunt and Cooke 1960, no. 538; Lugano 1989, no. 11.2

Mola was born near Lugano, now in the Swiss canton of Ticino, and as a child moved to Rome with his architect father. After training in Rome he spent much of his early career in Venice and then in Bologna, where he worked for a time with Francesco Albani. This drawing is a study for one of the first paintings that Mola executed on his return to Rome in 1647, a fresco of *Bacchus and Ariadne* in the Palazzo Costaguti (fig. 154), depicting the god greeting Ariadne on the island of Naxos after she had been abandoned by Theseus. The echoes of Bolognese classicism to which Mola was exposed during his spell with Albani are still strong, with the protagonists arranged in a frontal plane and the landscape as a backdrop, like Ludovico Carracci’s *St Ursula* (no. 120).

The commission is not documented, but the biographer Giovanni Battista Passeri, who knew Mola, stated that he painted the fresco for Giovanni Battista Costaguti. Sutherland Harris pointed out that Giovanni Battista Costaguti (1636–1704) was too young to be commissioning such decorations in his family palace in the late 1640s, and proposed, probably correctly, that the paintings in the palazzo were commissioned instead by Giovanni Battista’s elder brother, Vincenzo (1611–60), who was created a cardinal in 1643 and who left Rome as the papal legate to Urbino in 1649.

The study corresponds with the fresco in the principal figures, but lacks the airborne putti and differs in the background, where Silenus on his ass, for instance, is not on the left of the drawing and on the left of the painting. The drawing is executed in a technique typical of Mola, a substantial underdrawing of both red and black chalks and only a few strokes of the pen, with much more extensive drawing and shading with the brush. Two further drawings for the composition are known, a rapid pen sketch in the Louvre, and a squared final study in red chalk in the Teyler Museum, Haarlem.

---

1 Lugano 1989, no. 11.3.
2 Passeri 1772 edn, pp. 391–2; 1934 edn, p. 368.
3 Sutherland Harris 1974, p. 230; Rowlands 1964, p. 272, had already suggested Vincenzo Costaguti’s responsibility for the project without considering Passeri’s testimony. See also Vitzthum 1961, p. 517; Cocke 1972, p. 57; for Costaguti see Schleier 2000.
4 Louvre, inv. 8458; Teyler Museum, Haarlem, inv. k 75; Cocke 1972, figs. 39, 41. Cocke (figs. 42, 22) also related to the composition a double-sided sheet of sketches, then in the Krautheimer collection, New York, which shows on one side Silenus with his followers, and on the other putti surrounding a reclining figure.
SASSOFERRATO (GIOVANNI BATTISTA SALVI)
Sassoferrato, Marche 1609 – Rome 1685

135. The Mystic Marriage of St Catherine c.1650

Black and white chalk on buff paper
42.2 × 27.4 cm
Inscribed upper left, pen: 59
RL 6084

PROVENANCE
Purchased in Rome by Richard Dalton for George III, 1760s; Inv. A, p. 104, Gianbattista Salvi detto il Sassoferrato, among ‘67 Study’s for Various Pictures of Madonnas, Saints &c: mostly copied from Raphael, Guido & others (as He was not fertile in Invention) with several Portraits drawn from the Life’

REFERENCE
Blunt and Cooke 1960, no. 879

Giovanni Battista Salvi was born in the town of Sassoferrato, in the mountains of the Marche south of Urbino. After training with his father he reportedly studied under Domenichino, and from 1630 he was based for a decade in Perugia. He was in Rome by 1641 and seems to have spent much of the rest of his career there, though little is known about his later life. Sassoferrato worked in a deliberately archaising style completely at odds with the prevailing Baroque, more elegantly restrained even than Poussin and Sacchi, and in addition to his own compositions (mainly religious) and portraits, he painted many copies of works by Raphael, Perugino and other earlier artists.1

This is a final, closely squared study for the life-size Mystic Marriage of St Catherine in the Wallace Collection, London (fig. 155), the finest of Sassoferrato’s paintings to be found in Britain and one of his few large-scale works. The painting depicts the vision of St Catherine of Alexandria as recounted in the Golden Legend, in which the Virgin and Child appeared to the saint and Christ placed a ring on her finger, so making her his spiritual bride. At the saint’s feet are the broken wheel of her attempted martyrdom, and the sword with which she was beheaded.

The painting was almost certainly executed for the church of Santa Maria della Cima in Genzano, on the shore of Lake Nemi a little south of Rome, and was probably commissioned (by Duke Giuliano Cesari) soon after the church was completed in 1650.2 Ingamells noted the echoes of a fourteenth-century painting of the subject by Bartolo di Fredi, then in the convent of San Domenico, Perugia, where Sassoferrato had worked a few years before. The painting was removed probably in the early nineteenth century, and replaced by a same-size copy, which remains in the church.

The Royal Collection holds the largest surviving group of drawings by Sassoferrato, sixty sheets that were bought in Rome by Richard Dalton for George III, probably during the 1760s, for the modest sum of 20 scudi (£5).3 They presumably came en bloc from the artist’s studio, but their earlier history is unknown; the present sheet is heavily fly-spotted down the right edge, and must have lain in a portfolio with that side exposed at some time.

1 On Sassoferrato see Macé de Lépinay 1980; Sassoferrato 1990.
3 Royal Archives, Geo.15602.
Bernini was the outstanding figure of the Italian Baroque, a sculptor, architect, painter and playwright, whose boundless energy, imagination and religious conviction transformed the city of Rome. He trained with his father, the distinguished sculptor Pietro Bernini, and made his name with works of outstanding virtuosity such as the Apollo and Daphne (Galleria Borghese, Rome). The election in 1623 of Pope Urban VIII launched Bernini on an architectural career that began modestly with the small church of Santa Bibiana, growing in ambition under the patronage of successive popes to culminate in the colonnade before St Peter’s. Bernini’s finest designs seamlessly combined architecture, sculpture and sophisticated light effects – in works such as the Cornaro chapel in Santa Maria della Vittoria and the Cathedra Petri – to achieve the most intoxicating expressions of Counter-Reformation taste and religiosity.

Most of Bernini’s drawings are related to his grand projects, but a number of independent drawn portraits and figure studies also survive. This is one of four drawings of the same model, all in red and white chalk on a royal-size sheet of paper, trimmed somewhat by later collectors. To the posed figure Bernini here imaginatively added branches and foliage, and it is possible that he conceived of the figure as the cyclops Polyphemus, at the moment of spying his beloved but heedless Galatea in the arms of Acis (cf. nos. 114, 139). These drawings are not preparatory studies for any surviving sculpture or painting, and given their size and degree of finish it is likely that they were made as demonstration pieces. At the end of 1629 Bernini reluctantly accepted his nomination as head of the Accademia di San Luca for the following year, and the drawings have been associated with his presumed teaching responsibilities there, but they could equally have been made in the context of the occasional life-drawing classes that took place in his own studio.

An inscription on the verso of the drawing records its purchase for 6 scudi in 1682 by Michele Maglia, born Michel Maille, a French sculptor active in Rome between about 1678 and 1700. The ‘Cesare Madonna’ from whom he bought the sheet may conceivably have been the widow of Giovanni Cesari, a sometime assistant of Bernini.

1 The others are at Windsor (Blunt and Cooke 1960, no. 621); in the Uffizi (Sutherland Harris 1977b, no. 4); and in a private collection (Edinburgh 1998, no. 39).
Bernini was called upon to produce far more sculpture than he could ever carve himself, and most works from his maturity were carved by others to his designs. On both sides of this sheet are studies for a fountain commissioned by Duke Francesco d’Este for the courtyard of the Palazzo Ducale at Sassuolo, 9 miles (15 km) south of Modena. Bernini seems to have been approached about the project during the summer of 1652. That August, in a letter from Rome sent by the Duke’s agent, Bernini requested details about the layout of the palazzo; these were sent to him at the end of the month, and in September he provided a series of designs for the fountains.¹

Several drawings by Bernini survive for the project. The present sheet shows, on the recto, Neptune standing boldly astride two huge shells supported by sea-centaurs; on the verso (fig. 157), Neptune clammers over the acquiescent nymph Amphitrite, while a second sheet at Windsor reverses the roles of Neptune and Amphitrite.² In the Getty is a black-chalk drawing of a marine deity struggling with a dolphin,³ and a definitive pen-and-wash study of that design in the Victoria and Albert Museum may have been one of the drawings sent to the Duke for approval.⁴ Other studies of fountains have also been connected with the Sassuolo project, including a sheet in the British Museum,⁵ of a nymph reclining on a dolphin, and another in Berlin, of two tritons holding a gaping dolphin;⁶ but in the same year Bernini had been working on the design for the Fontana del Moro in Piazza Navona, and it is difficult to disentangle the spate of fountain designs from this period.

Bernini was asked by the Duke to name the best sculptors in Rome, who might work on the project. From Bernini’s suggestions his assistant Antonio Raggi was chosen, but Raggi’s participation seems to have been limited to executing terracotta models (one of which survives in the Galleria Estense, Modena), from which local craftsmen executed the fountains rather limply in stucco. The Neptune stands at one side of the vestibule (fig. 156), and the pose of the god corresponds closely with the present study. Facing Neptune across the vestibule is a Galatea, an unresolved and inept figure that is surely not to Bernini’s designs. In a niche at the far side of the courtyard is the Marine God with a Dolphin, and now standing on the grand staircase, though perhaps intended for the centre of the courtyard, is a group of Neptune Abducting Amphitrite, bearing little relationship to the playful figures seen in Bernini’s drawings.

¹ For the project see Donati 1941; Pirondini 1982, pp. 64–5, 138–9.
² Blunt and Cooke 1960, no. 45.
³ Goldner and Hendrix 1992, no. 5.
⁴ Ward-Jackson 1980, ii, no. 628.
⁵ Edinburgh 1998, no. 104.
⁶ Sutherland Harris 1977b, no. 55.
GIOVANNI ANGELO CANINI
Rome c.1617–1666

138. A male nude seen from below c.1660

Red chalk, stumped in places
51.4 × 39.5 cm
Inscribed lower centre, pen and ink, scratched out: Io Angelus Caninius Romanus Delin.;
and lower right, pencil: Angelo Canini
BL 01228

PROVENANCE
Royal Collection by c.1810 (Inv. A, p. 106, Accademie di Diversi Autori, among ‘4 [by] Benedetto Luti, and Angelo Canini’)

REFERENCE
Blunt and Cooke 1960, no. 103

Giovanni Angelo Canini was a typical footsoldier of the Roman Baroque, trained in the studios of Domenichino (nos. 116–17), Antonio Barbalunga and Pietro da Cortona (no. 127); he was a skilled draughtsman but an undistinguished painter, and many of his works were collaborative efforts under the supervision of a more talented artist.

This drawing is one of a number of figure studies inscribed in the same hand with an attribution to Canini (though here the ascription has been scratched out). Three of these at Düsseldorf bear variants on the inscription Io Angelus Caninius Ping. et delin. (‘Giovanni Angelo Canini painted and drew [it]’), with one of these (fig. 158), adding in Palatio Pont. in Quirinale Colle (‘in the pontifical palace on the Quirinal hill’). Turner related this last drawing to the decoration of the Gallery of Alexander VII (1656–7) in the Palazzo del Quirinale, a project controlled by Pietro da Cortona to which Canini contributed a Sacrifice of Isaac and a portion of the decorative surround, including figures in chiaroscuro.1 This setting has been destroyed, and there is no way of checking the accuracy of that inscription, but such specific annotations are often correct.

The figure here, unlike that in fig. 158, is drawn in daring foreshortening, as if standing on a ledge high above the viewer, and it is unlikely that it could have formed part of the Quirinale decorations. It may well have been purely a drawing exercise, and indeed the inscription here – unlike those on the Düsseldorf sheets – does not state that the figure was painted. Two other drawings at Windsor bear an analogous inscription, though they are much weaker in execution and each apparently by a different hand;2 this would imply that the inscriptions are not Canini’s signatures but attributions by an early collector. It is probable that all the inscribed sheets came as a group from Canini’s studio, with drawings by pupils and assistants mixed in with those by Canini himself.

1 Brink 2002, nos. 55, 58, 59. Another drawing by Canini bearing an inscription in the same hand is in the Uffizi (Florence 1997, no. 58).
2 Turner (N.) 1978, pp. 389–90. For the project see Jacob 1971.

Fig. 158 Giovanni Angelo Canini, A male nude; black chalk with discoloured white heightening, on blue paper, 55.4 × 38.3 cm (Kunstakademie, Düsseldorf)
The classical landscape had been developed by Annibale Carracci and Domenichino alongside their primarily figurative works, but the younger Claude Gellée devoted his whole career to the genre. Born in the Duchy of Lorraine, now in eastern France, Claude moved to Rome as a youth and worked there for the rest of his life. In his paintings he created an arcadia of shepherds and flocks, rustic dances and episodes from myth, legend or the Old Testament, played out before ruined temples, peaceful towns and castles, perfect trees and brooks, all bathed in a nostalgic golden light.

In 1657 Claude executed a pair of paintings depicting Acis and Galatea (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden; fig. 160) and the Transformation of the Apulian Shepherd (collection of the Duke of Sutherland). In the first painting, Claude faithfully followed the story of Acis and Galatea as recounted in Book xiii of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. The cyclops Polyphemus was infatuated with the sea-nymph Galatea; spurned by her in favour of the youth Acis, Polyphemus sat with his flocks on a promontory overlooking the sea and, playing his pipes, he sang her praises.

At Windsor are elaborate drawings for each of the two paintings, though in neither case does the composition agree closely with the canvas. The Dresden painting corresponds approximately in the figures of Acis and Galatea before their draped bower, though the landscape – while still a coastal scene with a mountain to the right – was wholly transformed. Despite their size and care of execution, the drawings must be regarded as interim attempts to assess the balance of the composition: in both cases the figures were traced through to the backs of the sheets (thus reversing them), allowing Claude to experiment by surrounding them with new landscapes.

Claude’s *Liber veritatis* (his drawn record of his paintings, now in the British Museum) states that both paintings were ‘faict pour m’Delagard’. While the identity of this patron is not known with certainty, Boyer’s suggestion that he could have been Pierre-Gilbert de La Garde (d. 1659), a member of the household of Louis XIV, or more probably his son Jacques de La Garde (c. 1634–84) is very plausible.1

1 Boyer 2001, no. 11; see also Roethlisberger 1961, nos. 236–7; Kitson 1978, p.141.
GIOVANNI BENEDETTO CASTIGLIONE
Genoa 1609 – Mantua 1664

140. Circe c. 1650 – 55

Brown and red-brown oil paint on paper
39.4 × 56.0 cm
81.4067

PROVENANCE
Possibly acquired on the artist’s death by Carlo II Gonzaga, 9th Duke of Mantua (1629–65), and inherited by Ferdinando Carlo, 10th Duke (1650–1708); Zaccaria Sagredo, from whose heirs purchased by Consul Joseph Smith, c. 1743–55; from whom purchased by George III, 1762; Inv. A, p. 137, Castiglione Tom. VI, p. 5, ‘Circe’

REFERENCES
Blunt 1954, no. 133; Percy 1971, no. 71

Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione’s career centred on his home city of Genoa, though he also worked for several years in Rome and Naples, and towards the end of his life he spent time in Venice, Parma, and particularly Mantua, where he was patronised by the 9th Duke, Carlo II Gonzaga. This itinerant career and an intellectual bent gave Castiglione’s art a strongly eclectic flavour, combining influences as diverse as northern prints (especially those of Rembrandt) and the classicising paintings of Poussin; he was also technically adventurous, most notably in his prints and his oil drawings. While Castiglione is documented as a youth only in the studio of Giovanni Battista Paggi (1626–7), the biographer Rafaele Soprani claimed in 1674 that he also studied with Anthony Van Dyck,1 who was in Genoa intermittently between 1621 and 1627, and from whom he may have picked up the habit of drawing in oil paint on paper. The flowing strokes of the brush that this technique required were ideally suited to Castiglione’s verve as a draughtsman, and he produced many such drawings throughout his career, mostly as independent works of art rather than studies for paintings. The endless recurrence of certain subjects – especially episodes from the Old Testament and the journeys of herdsmen – makes the dating of his drawings problematic, for it is difficult to associate drawings and paintings with confidence.

This drawing depicts the sorceress Circe surrounded by the companions of Odysseus whom she has turned into animals, and whose clothes and armour lie empty on the steps before her (for the subject see no. 23). Castiglione treated the theme several times in the 1650s, in paintings, drawings and an etching.2 Though the present sheet does not bear a direct relationship to any of these, it is close in conception to two paintings, one in Palazzo Spinola, Genoa (perhaps the Circe that was among the paintings noted in the account book of Ansaldo Pallavicino in April 16523), and another dated 1653 in the collection of the Order of Malta.4

The drawing is one of five stylistically identical sheets by Castiglione at Windsor, each measuring close to 39 × 55 cm, the others being an Adoration of the Golden Calf, an Allegory in honour of the Duke of Mantua, a Vanitas with musicians, and a Black page with a dog.5 The second of these depicts a mother nursing a child, apparently alluding to the birth in 1650 of Carlo II’s heir, Ferdinando Carlo, and thus supporting the dating of the whole group to the early 1650s.6

It is possible that many of Castiglione’s drawings were acquired after his death in Mantua by Carlo II Gonzaga. In 1707 Carlo’s son Ferdinando Carlo was forced to accept Austrian rule in Mantua and moved to Venice, where he sold off much of the family collection before his death in 1708, and this may have been the means by which Castiglione became so well known and admired in Venice in the eighteenth century. His drawings were to be found in the collections of Zaccaria Sagredo, Francesco Algarotti and Anton Maria Zanetti, and his compositional and figure types suffuse the work of Giovanni Battista Tiepolo. Joseph Smith bought most of his Castigliones from the heirs of Sagredo at some point between 1743 and 1755 (and was given others by Algarotti); they were listed in Smith’s will of 1761 as four Volumes containing original drawings by Gio. Benedetto Castiglione.

1 Soprani 1674, p. 223.
2 See for example Percy 1971, figs. 20, 27, nos. 70, 130, 123; Genoa 1990, nos. 18, 28, 43.
3 Boccardo 1987, p. 65.
4 Genoa 1990, no. 18. A variant of that painting bearing the same date was formerly in a Genoese collection and is now untraced: Delogu 1928, pl. 22.
5 Respectivey Blunt 1954, nos. 64, 132, 134, 136; a Bacchanal with a lion (no. 135) is stylistically congruent and the same width, but only 34 cm high.
6 For the dating see Percy 1971, pp. 98–9; Genoa 1990, pp. 140–41.
In addition to his dazzling oil drawings (no. 140), Castiglione executed many etchings and seems to have invented the monotype process. This hybrid of drawing and printmaking usually involves drawing an image with printing ink on a metal plate, laying a sheet of paper over the plate and passing plate and paper through a press, though in principle any liquid or friable medium, any smooth support, and any method of pressure will produce an analogous result (as in the practice of taking offsets of chalk drawings – see no. 147).

Castiglione experimented with both basic modes of monotype, the positive, in which the image is drawn directly with the ink, and the negative, in which the ink is spread evenly on the plate and the image scraped into it. His most sophisticated monotypes use both methods, as here – most of the image is drawn, but much detail has also been scratched out, most obviously in the turban, beard and fur collar.

The first pull of a monotype does not remove all the ink from the plate, and it is usually possible to take further, successively weaker pulls; one of Castiglione’s monotypes survives in two impressions, and several others are pale and appear to be second pulls, the first of which is in each case lost. The monotype impression here is relatively weak and flat, and was probably a second pull, extensively worked up by the artist to strengthen the image. In addition to the brown wash that gives the sheet an overall tone and some detail at upper left (though the tone over and in front of the face is an accidental stain), there are brushed-on additions with what appears to be the same printer’s ink as the monotype itself. This is particularly noticeable in two large areas below the beard, in the eye and ear, in the upper and lower edges of the turban, and in some dry strokes filling the void along the lower edge.

Blunt noted that in a letter of 16 January 1759 to Anton Maria Zanetti, Francesco Algarotti wrote of a print of ‘a beautiful head of an old man’ by Castiglione, that he had been given by Giovanni Domenico Tiepolo, and that he had in turn given to Count Brühl. Algarotti described the print as made ‘in such a manner that it appeared touched with the brush’, and Blunt suggested that that print might therefore have been another pull of the same monotype – though it could equally have been the similar head in the Courtauld Institute.1

Castiglione was very fond of exotic heads such as these; they feature in many of his paintings and drawings, and he etched two series, large and small, of heads in fanciful costume. The principal source for these was of course Rembrandt, who etched many similar heads during the 1630s (fig. 161).  

1 Blunt 1954, p. 25, note 2; Algarotti 1791–4, VIII, p. 75.
Giovanni Andrea Sirani was the principal assistant of Guido Reni (nos. 118–19) during the latter part of Reni’s career, and remained faithful to his master’s classicising style when he pursued an independent career after Reni’s death. The drawing corresponds with a painting by Sirani for the high altar of the conventual church of San Ludovico (or Santi Ludovico ed Alessio), Bologna (fig. 162). Below the Madonna and Child are: St Louis (Ludovico) of Toulouse, standing to the left; kneeling next to him, the Baptist; standing behind, Sts Francis and Claire; kneeling at far right, St Anthony of Padua; and in the foreground, St Alexius (Alessio).1

The painting was commissioned to take the place of Annibale Carracci’s altarpiece of the same subject (with St Catherine instead of St Anthony) when that painting was moved to the inner chapel of the convent in the mid-seventeenth century.2 No documents regarding the commission have been discovered, and the painting was first briefly mentioned in a guidebook of 1666.3 In 1757, on the instigation of the Archbishop of Bologna, Cardinal Malvezzi, Sirani’s painting was swapped around with Annibale’s, and placed in the inner chapel.4 Both paintings were sequestered on the suppression of the convent during the Napoleonic occupation. Annibale’s altarpiece was moved to the Accademia and is now in the Pinacoteca, and Sirani’s was assigned to the Bolognese church in Rome, Santi Giovanni e Petronio, where it took the place of Domenichino’s Madonna and Child with Sts John the Evangelist and Petronius, which was itself transferred to the Brera.5

The drawing agrees with the painting closely: here St Louis lacks his beard, St Alexius his staff, and the base of the column is placed too high, but otherwise the correspondence is exact. The schematic outlines give the sheet the appearance of a copy, and the pen lines have been incised with a sharp stylus to transfer the composition to another sheet. It is possible that the sheet is in fact not a study by Giovanni Andrea but a record of the composition by Elisabetta Sirani, among whose drawings the sheet was mounted for George III. Giovanni Andrea’s three daughters Elisabetta, Anna Maria and Barbara all practised as artists; of these Elisabetta was much the most talented, outstripping her father and famed throughout Europe before her early death. Many of Elisabetta’s studies are executed in a distinctive technique of soft black chalk and pale wash alone, but as she trained and worked closely with Giovanni Andrea it can be difficult to distinguish their pen drawings.

1 For the painting see Negro and Pirondini 1992, pp. 368–9, note 22.
2 Posner 1971, no. 41.
3 Masini 1666, p. 385.
4 Crespi 1769, p. 71.
Johann Paul Schor was a son of the German painter Hans Schor, and after training in his native Innsbruck he settled in Rome around 1640. At first he worked primarily as a painter (with, among others, Pietro da Cortona, no. 127), but increasingly he came to specialise as a decorative designer, often in collaboration with Bernini (nos. 116–7), producing many drawings for theatrical and festival ephemera, stucco decorations, coaches, tableware and so on.¹

This elaborate drawing, together with two others at Windsor offering alternatives (figs. 163–4), must have been a design for the decoration of a salone for Pope Alexander VII (Fabio Chigi; r. 1655–67). The designs are replete with the Chigi emblems of oak leaves, the six monti and an eight-pointed star, and the present sheet also includes a number of depictions of the Pope’s building projects. The figure at lower centre holds an octagonal tablet with an elevation and partial section of the church of San Tommaso di Villanova at Castel Gandolfo, built to Bernini’s designs in 1658–61. By her side is a larger oval panel with a view of the high altar of that church, and above the window is a painting of the Pope and his retinue in the countryside with Castel Gandolfo in the distance.

The drawing is rather hard to read, and it is difficult to separate illusionistic from real architectural forms. The cornice running through the centre of the sheet indicates that the wall surface is flat, with a window bay the full height of the wall, and a barrel vault arching over the viewer. The apparently apsidal space above the cornice, seen in all three studies, may be fictive; Schor has here made no attempt to construct a convincing perspectival effect for the octagonal coffering, though in the other two studies the ceiling is drawn as if it is domed.

Werkner suggested the drawings might be studies for a library or cabinet room,² though the absence of furniture other than the large credenza at lower left argues against this proposal; the fictive books behind and on the lap of the figure at lower left, and seen again in figs. 163–4, may identify her simply as a personification of Learning. The repeated depiction in the cartouches of the papal villa at Castel Gandolfo would imply that the decoration was intended for an interior there,³ though Michel⁴ and more recently Morello⁵ have suggested that the drawings might instead be connected with Schor’s decorations in the Gallery of Urban VIII in the library of the Vatican, begun around 1662, left unfinished and later destroyed.

¹ For Schor see e.g. Werkner 1980; Werkner 1982; Fusconi 1986.
³ As was assumed by Lo Bianco 1982, pp. 117–18.
⁴ Michel 1982.
Lauri trained initially with his father, the Flemish landscape artist Balthasar Lauwers (Italianised as Lauri) who had settled in Rome before Filippo’s birth, and then with his brother Francesco, who had been a pupil of Andrea Sacchi (no. 131). He thus gained experience both of small-scale cabinet painting and of large-scale decorative schemes, and from the 1650s he worked on a series of projects for some of the most eminent patrons in Rome.

This drawing is a study for a ceiling in the Palazzo Borghese, Rome, remodelled between 1671 and 1678 for Giovanni Battista Borghese by the architect Carlo Rainaldi. The decorating of the rooms started immediately each had been built, beginning with a pair of apartments on the lower mezzanine. Paintings by Lauri, Luigi Garzi, Gaspard Dughet and a team of assistants under Ciro Ferri (no. 147) were executed between 1671 and 1673, with payments to Lauri between November 1671 and June 1672. Lauri, Garzi and Ferri were already in the employ of Borghese, having been commissioned to paint an altarpiece each for the new church of Santi Gregorio e Antonino, while Dughet, the brother-in-law of Nicolas Poussin, was well established as one of Rome’s leading landscapists.

The ceiling was described in detail by Francesco Saverio Baldinucci (son of Filippo) in a manuscript biography of Lauri:

In 1671 he painted in gouache [i.e. not in fresco], in the palace of Prince Borghese in Rome, the vault of a little room, representing at its apex the fabled wedding of Bacchus and Ariadne, crowned by Venus in the presence of satyrs and bacchantes celebrating with cups of wine and with musical instruments in their hands. In the decorations of the four windows are painted four fables, in roundels carried by figures in chiaroscuro, the same size (three palmi) as the others. And these are: Io, converted into a cow and guarded by Argus, who, searched for by her father, writes her name in the earth with a hoof. In the second can be seen Io enjoyed by Jupiter in the form of clouds, while Juno stares at them with a spiteful face, breathing jealousy. In the third is the nymph Garamantis seen bathing in a stream by Jupiter, who, turned on by her, flies in on the wings of an eagle to embrace her; and she, fleeing, is caught by a crayfish who bites her foot, and is ravished. The fourth shows the river-god Alpheus pursuing Arethusa, while Diana protects her by interposing a cloud and by shooting an arrow to tear open the earth; falling into the hole, the nymph is transformed into a river.3

There has been some confusion about the mythological episodes depicted in this drawing. That on the left corresponds with the painted tondo of Jupiter and Garamantis, a rarely represented myth which is described in Book 11, Chapter 11, of Boccaccio’s Genealogy of the Gods.3 The scene on the right is not to be found on the Palazzo Borghese ceiling, and seems to depict Pan and Syrinx, resembling as it does
Nicolas Poussin’s painting of the subject (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden).4 Between the pediments, and on the short walls, were rectangular ‘frames’ in the curves of the vault, which were filled with mythological landscapes by Dughet.5 Here Lauri displaced the central frame a little to the left, probably to enhance the illusion, when entering the room, that the frames stood proud of the curve of the ceiling and that the pediments projected in front of them. The frame as painted was stripped of its winged bucranium, and the mask in a shell above was flanked only by garlands; the putti were used instead for the frames of the landscapes on the short walls of the ceiling, where they support the dragon and eagle of the Borghese arms.

1 For the project see Bosclair 1976; Fumagalli 1994, pp. 69–75. So compact is the room that no photograph showing the whole of the decoration has been taken. Details of the decoration can be seen in Bodart 1970, ii, fig. 71; Bosclair 1976; Fumagalli 1994, figs. 69, 74–81.

2 Baldinucci 1775 edn, p. 171.

3 I know of only one other representation of this episode, probably an unused design by Annibale Carracci for the Galleria Farnese, known through an etching and drawn copies after a lost original: Louvre, invs. 7177 and 7561 (Loisel 2004, no. 561).

4 Paintings reproducing three of the tondi, complete with the curved pediment and supporting ignudi, were formerly in the Bautier collection in Brussels (illustrated in Bodart 1970, ii, figs. 68–70), and sold at Christie’s, Rome, 26 November 1986, lots 85–7. A rectangular version of Jupiter and Garamantis is in the collection of the Earl of Bradford.

5 Baldinucci stated that the landscapes were painted alone by Dughet, and their style supports this, but Fumagalli (1994, p. 74, figs. 74–7) argued that they were painted in collaboration with Lauri.
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Gaulli left his home city of Genoa before 1658, and was based in Rome for the rest of his life. He was a protégé of Bernini (nos. 136–7), through whom he obtained some of his most important early commissions, culminating in the frescoes in the vault of the Gesù (1672–83); but in addition to such large-scale fresco decoration, Gaulli was equally accomplished in portraiture, small-scale subject painting and altarpieces.

This drawing depicts the appearance of God (with a rainbow as a sign of his covenant) to Noah and his family, as they offer a sacrifice in thanksgiving for their deliverance from the Flood (Genesis 8: 20–9: 17). It is in the style of Gaulli’s studies of the early to mid-1670s, and is close in format to a painting of the subject now in the Palazzo Bianco, Genoa, of c.1670, while differing in almost all details: the Genoa painting lacks the dominant group of the Almighty, Noah stands prominently to the left, and a sheep calmly awaits the sacrifice. Given the degree of cogitation of the drawing and yet the differences between it and the painting, it is hard to see it as a preparatory study, and Brugnoli was probably correct in seeing the drawing as an elaboration of the subject, of a few years later.3

1 See e.g. studies for Sant’Agnese, the Gesù, and St Peter’s: Graf 1976, nos. 237–41; Turner and Eitel-Porter 1999, no. 110.
4 Enggass 1964c, p. 121.
6 Ariccia 1999, p. 197.
7 Graf 1976, nos. 367–74.
8 Edinburgh 1998, no. 171.
The meaning of the allegory was given in a pamphlet entitled *Della pittura della libreria del monastero di S. Michele in Bosco dei PP. Olivetani*, published in 1681, the year after the completion of the frescoes:

Divine Wisdom stands on a square stone, with a white dress and blue cloak. She holds her right hand over the head of a lamb laid on the Book of the Seven Seals, supported by an angel; with her left hand she points to the figure of Glory, who dispenses a golden crown to Merit and one of laurel to Virtue, who, dressed in blue and green, with the sun on her breast and her left hand on a spear, receives the said crown with a reverent gesture. Below her cloak is a cupid with a bow and quiver, who is chased by a putto, while one of his companions with a branch of laurel chases another vice. Merit, dressed in blue with a red cloak and holding in his left hand a sceptre, holds out his right hand to receive the golden crown carried to him by Glory, a large flying figure with a crown of palms. Below Divine Wisdom is Human Wisdom, on whom fall some shafts of light between the dense clouds. She is dressed in yellow and white with a book in her lap, and she covers her eyes with her right hand, through the fingers of which pass some rays of Divine Wisdom...

Enveloped by the clouds around Human Wisdom (around whom are some of her followers) are several putti, who light tapers with the divine rays to illuminate her, and in particular one who tries to light an extinguished lamp. Around the clouds are three putti, two of whom hold a crown of laurel, and all united to bestow it to honour the lovers of virtue.²

There is an earlier study for the same composition in Michigan,³ and two sketches for the group of Glory crowning Merit and Virtue in the Albertina.⁴

---

² The text of the pamphlet was transcribed in Arze 1850, p. xiv.
³ Feinblatt 1960, p. 166; Ottawa 1982, no. 70.
CIRO FERRI
Rome c.1634–1689

147. Perseus armed by Minerva and Jupiter c.1680
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Ciro Ferri trained under Pietro da Cortona (no. 127) in Rome and stayed remarkably true to Cortona’s style throughout his career. This pair of drawings together form a working study for a large print of the Arming of Perseus,1 engraved by Jean Louis Roullet to Ferri’s designs, dedicated to the Holy Roman Emperor Leopold I to commemorate his role in the defence of Europe against the Ottoman Turks. Europe is personified as Andromeda, tied to the rocks and menaced by a sea-monster in the background; Minerva oversees the forging of Perseus’s armour in the foreground, while Jupiter charges Perseus with his mission. A pair of captive Turks are manacled to the cartouche in the foreground.

The inscription at the bottom of the print credits Ferri with the design (Inv.) and states that Pietro Lucatelli, Ferri’s assistant, made the detailed drawing (or drawings) from which the engraver worked (Delin.). Accordingly Dreyer and Davis both rejected the old attribution to Ferri of the present pair of sheets, attributing them to Lucatelli.2 Much of the red chalk is offset and schematic in nature; the black chalk elaboration of the figures is, however, of high quality and exactly in Ferri’s style, quite unlike Lucatelli’s dry drawing style as known through hundreds of his sheets in Berlin (including three detailed figure studies for the present composition).3

The reverses of the sheets are blackened with charcoal and the outlines of the composition are pressed through with a stylus, to transfer the design to another surface. It would appear that the collaboration of Ferri and Lucatelli in the production of the design for the engraver was not a simple two-stage process in which Ferri provided the basic layout and Lucatelli then elaborated this into a single detailed drawing for the engraver. First, the offsetting of the red chalk implies that Ferri designed the composition in the intended sense of the engraving, then produced an offset of that design to reverse it (as the process of printing would reverse it back again). Ferri himself worked up some of the figures, such as Perseus and the figures of Fame at the top of the design; others were left to Lucatelli to elaborate in individual figure studies. The engraver would probably have been provided not with a single unwieldy sheet in which all the required details were to be found, but with this overall compositional sheet from which the framework of the composition could be taken, to be ‘filled in’ with Lucatelli’s studies of individual details.

The print is not dated, and the natural assumption that the subject of the print refers specifically to the relief of the Siege of Vienna in 1683 may be incorrect. Writing a century after the print was produced, Gori Gandellini stated that the success of engravings of the Allegory of the Feats of Hercules and the Forge of Vulcan caused Ferri to adopt Roullet as his principal engraver.4 While many impressions of the Feats of Hercules are known, no impression of a Forge of Vulcan has come to light. It is possible that Gandellini was in fact referring to the Arming of Perseus, which prominently features a forge scene, implying that the Perseus was roughly contemporary with the Feats of Hercules, which can be no later than 1676.

1 Repr. Dreyer 1967, fig. 25.
4 Gori Gandellini 1771, iii, p. 144.
Beinaschi trained at the Savoy court in Turin with the portraitist Esprit Grandjean. By 1652 he had moved to Rome, where he worked in the studio of Pietro del Po, who some years earlier had been Lanfranco’s assistant in the decoration of Santi Apostoli, Naples (see no. 132). Beinaschi himself moved to Naples in 1664, executing many fresco cycles at great speed for the churches in the city. He was responsive to many different aspects of Seicento art, but especially to Lanfranco (and through him to Lanfranco’s Parmese predecessor Correggio), whose style he absorbed with great facility and to whom Beinaschi’s drawings were frequently attributed in the past.

Due to financial difficulties, the building of the dome of Santi Apostoli was not begun until 1664, almost twenty years after Lanfranco finished his immense cycle of paintings in the church. The dome was closed in 1680, whereupon Beinaschi and his assistant Orazio Frezza began the fresco of *Paradise with Christ in Glory*, completing the work in 1682 (fig. 166).1 According to De Domenici, Beinaschi – in spite of his experience – was awarded the contract only after he had proved himself by first painting scenes from the story of the Archangel Michael (now lost) for the Teatine Fathers, who were inclined to give the commission instead to Luca Giordano or Francesco Solimena (who had himself just completed a *Paradise* in the cupola of the cathedral at Nocera).2 Beinaschi’s fresco recalls the structure of the *Paradise* painted by Lanfranco in the cupola of the Cappella del Tesoro of Naples cathedral, with successive tiers of figures around a central radiance; Lanfranco’s fresco, however, is focused on God the Father at the centre of the dome, where Beinaschi’s has only a divine light, and attention is focused instead on the figure of Christ in Glory among the Elect.

The drawing is one of a set of four at Windsor, formerly ascribed to Lanfranco and recognised as Beinaschi’s by Bean and Vitzthum in the first substantial treatment of the artist’s drawings.3 Three of the four figures are to be found in the cupola, the present study corresponding with a prophet below and to the right of Christ.

---

1 For the project see Prota-Giurleo 1957; Strazzullo 1959.
2 De Domenici 1742–5, p. 278; see also Nicodemi 1993, pp. 39–42.
St John expounding the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception c. 1684–6
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Carlo Maratti was the leading exponent of Classicism in late Baroque Rome, principal of the Accademia di San Luca from 1664 and the most influential artist in the city after Bernini’s death. He was also a distinguished collector: his hoard of thousands of drawings by other artists was bought in 1703 by Clement XI, who probably also acquired drawings from Maratti’s studio after the artist’s death ten years later. Clement XI’s drawings passed on his death to his nephew Alessandro Albani, who sold them in 1762 to James Adam on behalf of George III. Maratti’s collections thus form a large portion of the seventeenth-century Roman drawings now in the Royal Collection.

The Cybo Chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo, Rome, was built for Cardinal Alderano Cybo (1613–1700) by the architect Carlo Fontana between 1682 and 1684, as a burial chapel for Cybo and his ancestor Cardinal Lorenzo Cybo, whose original tomb had stood on the site. The project was apparently assigned initially to the aged Bernini (nos. 126–7), who had years earlier completed Raphael’s Chigi Chapel directly across the nave of the church. When Fontana assumed the commission on Bernini’s death in 1680, he retained the sense of engagement with Raphael’s model that Bernini had presumably planned. Maratti’s altarpiece (fig. 167), begun after completion of the building work in 1684 and finished around 1686, was painted in oils directly on to the wall of the chapel, an unusual technique that emulated Sebastiano del Piombo’s Birth of the Virgin in the Chigi Chapel.

The altarpiece depicts St John the Evangelist explaining the Immaculate Conception to three Doctors of the Church, Sts Gregory, Augustine and John Chrysostom. Such theological subjects were difficult to handle pictorially as there was little opportunity for narrative, and the unusually large number of surviving compositional drawings allow us to follow in detail the artist’s attempts to arrive at a design that combined spatial and iconographic clarity.

In the earliest studies in Madrid and New York, St John stands to the right, gesturing down to a book held by St Gregory, with a rather undignified St Augustine at ground level behind the Evangelist. Here the three saints all gaze at the Evangelist, thus leaving the Virgin isolated in the heavens above. This was corrected in pen studies in Madrid and a red-chalk drawing at Chatsworth, in which St Gregory was moved from his central position to sit opposite St John, and St John Chrysostom looks up to the Virgin.

Another study in New York then reversed the positions of the saints, thus moving St Augustine to the right. This was followed by a sketch in Düsseldorf and a more careful version in the Morgan Library, which introduced the motif of the Evangelist gesturing to the Virgin, and moved St Augustine back to the lower left. The final adjustment turned St Augustine’s gaze up from his book to the Virgin, providing another link between the earth and the heavens; this is seen in a schematic chalk sketch in Madrid, which may however be a copy after the final design.

St John forms the three-way fulcrum of the composition, gesturing upwards to the Virgin and across to the tight group of Sts Gregory and John Chrysostom, with his left leg planted by the seated figure of St Augustine.

These compositional drafts were accompanied by many studies of individual poses and gestures, as Maratti sought to perfect his design. He would have been conscious both of the position of the chapel, opposite that planned by his revered Raphael, and of the fact that he would have to paint the altarpiece in situ, not in the relative comfort of his own studio.

1 For the project see in particular Sutherland Harris and Schaar 1967, pp. 126–8; Westin 1975, pp. 55–7; Turner and Eitel-Porter 1999, pp. 135–6.
2 Nieto Alcaide 1965, no. 19, and Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 63.18; Bean 1979, no. 277. Another study in Madrid (Nieto Alcaide 1965, no. 18) concentrates on the upper zone and is thus impossible to place in sequence. A drawing in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, of the school of Maratti and showing the Virgin with four saints, was thought by Westin (1975, no. 29) to be a first study for the painting, but was dismissed on stylistic and iconographical grounds by Bean (1979, no. 282) and not mentioned by Turner and Eitel-Porter 1999, pp. 135–6.
3 Nieto Alcaide 1965, nos. 20, 21.
4 Jaffé (M.) 1994, no. 260; Jaffé (M.) 1987, no. 47, also reproducing a drawing in the Plymouth City Museum and Art Gallery that studies or records another composition in which the saints all look at the book to which the Evangelist points.
5 Bean 1979, no. 278.
6 Sutherland Harris and Schaar 1967, no. 342.
7 New York 1967, no. 116; Westin 1975, no. 32.
8 Nieto Alcaide 1965, no. 23; Turner and Eitel-Porter 1999, p. 136 suggested that it might be a copy by Pietro de’ Pietri.
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The drawing is a study for a mosaic of the prophet Balaam pointing to the Star of David, in a pendentive of the Cappella della Presentazione, the second chapel in the left aisle of St Peter’s, Rome. Maratti was commissioned some time during the 1670s to paint canvases as models for mosaics above Giovanni Francesco Romanelli’s altarpiece of the Presentation of the Virgin of 1638-42 (which was itself replaced by a mosaic copy in 1728). Maratti received a first payment for two models for the pendentives in March 1684, and had finished all four, depicting the prophets Aaron, Noah, Gideon and Balaam, by the following year. Fabio Cristofari began work on the mosaics in late 1683, completing the pendentives and lunettes before his death in January 1689.

There was then a break in the work until 1704, when Maratti provided five models for sections of the vault of the chapel, depicting the Coronation of the Virgin and the Defeat of the Rebel Angels (Giuseppe Conti having succeeded Cristofari as the mosaicist). But Maratti was now an old man, and Giuseppe Chiari was in 1708 charged with painting further models on the basis of drawings provided by Maratti. The mosaics of the chapel were finally completed in 1725. Maratti’s models for the lunettes now hang in the Benediction Loggia of St Peter’s; his models for the pendentives are lost; and the models for the vault were taken in 1727 to the cathedral of Urbino, where they were destroyed when the dome collapsed in 1789.1

Also at Windsor is a nude study for Balaam (fig. 169),2 and there are further studies for the figure in Düsseldorf.3 Maratti seems to have based the pose on a drawing by Giovanni Lanfranco for a prophet in Santi Apostoli, Naples (fig. 168),4 and it is probable that he owned that drawing and another fifty-five by Lanfranco and his circle, which were later bound as an album for George III (rl 5666-5720).

2 Blunt and Cooke 1960, no. 297.
3 Sutherland Harris and Schaar 1967, nos. 302–4.
4 Blunt and Cooke 1960, no. 197.
Daniel Seiter was born in Vienna and trained as a fortifications engineer, but fled for Venice after a duel. There he studied as a painter in the studio of Johann Carl Loth, who though German had himself lived in Italy all his adult life, and Seiter's style thus bears little trace of his northern roots. In 1680 Seiter travelled to Rome, where he became closely associated with Carlo Maratti and his followers in the Accademia di San Luca, executing, for example, the side paintings in the Cybo Chapel of Santa Maria del Popolo (see no. 149). In 1688 Seiter moved to Turin to work for Duke Vittorio Amadeo II, painting many ceiling decorations in the Palazzo Reale and other ducal palaces, in which he combined the strong yet subtle chiaroscuro of Loth with the monumental Baroque effects of Roman art, often harking back to the generation of Pietro da Cortona (see no. 127). The figure style of his drawings also shows that he had looked closely at Cortona, and indeed one sheet by Seiter at Windsor, a study for the ceiling of the Sala del Caffè of the Palazzo Reale, bears an erroneous old ascription to Cortona.1

This drawing is a study for the canvas of Diana and Endymion (fig. 170), painted c.1693–4 and set into the ceiling of the Duke's bedroom in the Palazzo Reale, now known as the Camera da Dormire della Regina.2 The myth of Diana and Endymion was told in several versions. The beautiful shepherd Endymion was seen sleeping on Mount Latmos by the moon goddess Diana, who visited him each night and watched over him; one account relates that it was Jupiter who had put Endymion into perpetual sleep, in exchange for the gift of eternal youth. Here Endymion sleeps against a hillock, despite the efforts of a putto with a horn to wake him. Diana looks chastely down from the disc of the moon, her chariot drawn by two deer, while below are the satyrs of the wilderness.

Though the sheet is squared for transfer, it is some way from the painting, in which the tiered composition seen here was abandoned in favour of a more dynamic diagonal arrangement, with Diana expressing active astonishment at Endymion's beauty and the shepherd less voluptuously posed. A sketch in the Louvre,3 though rougher than this drawing, is actually much closer to the painting. It may well be that the present drawing was Seiter's first proposal for the ceiling, rejected by his patron and thus compelling him to rethink the layout of the composition, and that in the Louvre sketch he quickly rearranged the elements of this initial attempt.

1 Blunt 1971, no. 426.
3 Louvre, inv. RF 41105; Kunze 1997, no. 35.
DOMENICO PIOLA
Genoa 1627–1703

152. A woman offering a thesis to a personification of Liguria c. 1695
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Domenico Piola was the most eminent of a family of artists whose workshop dominated Genoese painting for fifty years around 1700. He collaborated at various times with his brothers Pellegrino and Giovanni Andrea, with his sons Paolo Gerolamo, Anton Maria and Giovanni Battista, and with his sons-in-law Gregorio de' Ferrari and Domenico Parodi, producing a succession of extravagant interior decorations for the palaces of Genoa. Domenico also worked on easel paintings for churches and private collectors, and produced many designs for book illustrations and other engravings.

The drawing is a finished model for an engraving by Martial Desbois, and depicts a woman offering a bound thesis to a personification of Liguria. The figure of Liguria closely follows the prescription in Cesare Ripa's Iconologia:

A lean woman, with a fierce and vigorous appearance, seated on a rock or boulder. She should have a simple dress with gold embroidery, a corslet, and a helmet on her head. She should hold up her open right hand, in the middle of which should be depicted an eye, and in her right hand she should gracefully bear a palm branch; and nearby on the right side should be a rudder, and on the left a shield with two or three arrows…

She is depicted lean and seated on a rock because the greater part of this province is sterile… The dress with gold embroidery denotes the great quantity of money, gold, silver and other infinite riches with which these people abound… She holds the palm branch in her left hand to show that this province receives no little honour each year from this plant, because the Pope gives blessings each Lent with its chaste branches…

The open right hand with the eye in its middle signifies the industry of these people, with which they make up for the deficiencies of the land by providing everything they need with their various skills… The figure is depicted with a fierce appearance, armoured with a corslet, a helmet on her head, and with a simple dress, because as Strabone in his fourth book and Biondo narrate, the Ligurians have always been the best and bravest soldiers.

In the drawing Piola swapped the emblems in the right and left hands of the figure because the engraving would reverse the sense of the composition. To the rudder, shield and arrows Piola added a heap of military trophies, together with a shield bearing the motto of Genoa, Libertas, and putti playing with a papal tiara and cardinal's hat. Above is the figure of Fame blowing a trumpet, the arms of Genoa (and more trophies), and in the distance a view of the city's harbour with its famous lighthouse.

An early impression of the print in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, carries the pen inscription Marie Helene Lusiniana dedie des theses de Theologie au Senat de Genes en 1695.

The design may have been commissioned to serve as the frontispiece to one specific academic thesis – perhaps even that of Lusiniana – but such a general image could in principle have been used as the frontispiece for any academic thesis produced by a woman in Genoa. The date in the inscription quoted gives a terminus ante quem for the print.

The personification of Liguria was a prominent subject for Genoese artists during the 1690s. Throughout the decade there was much jockeying to obtain the commission to fresco the vault of the Sala del Maggior Consiglio in the Palazzo Ducale, the central section of which was to depict Liguria Triumphant. Among the artists who submitted proposals were Domenico Piola and his son Paolo Gerolamo (as seen in bozzetti in the Palazzo Bianco, Genoa⁴), and the expatriate Giovanni Battista Gaulli.⁵ Perhaps surprisingly, the contract was won in 1700 by the Bolognese artist Marcantonio Franceschini,⁶ while the adjacent Sala del Minor Consiglio was similarly furnished with huge canvases sent to Genoa by the Neapolitan Francesco Solimena.

1 For the engraving see Newcome 1982, pp. 609–10, fig. 15; Sanguineti 2004, no. V30. Kurz (1955, no. 240) favoured the attribution in Inventory A to that offered in the old inscriptions on the reverse of the drawing, suggesting that it was a copy after Franceschini; the attribution to Piola was reasserted by Pouncey (cited in Blunt 1971, p. 108), by Bean (1958, p. 272), by Torriti (1962, p. 424), and by Malagoli (1966, p. 507, note 16).
2 Ripa 1603, pp. 249–50.
4 Newcome 1977, fig. 24.
6 Torriti 1962, p. 444.
Dal Sole trained in his native Bologna briefly with Domenica Maria Canuti (no. 146) and then with Lorenzo Pasinelli, though many aspects of his art hark back to the earlier classicism of Reni and the Carracci. He executed a number of large-scale fresco decorations during the 1680s and 1690s, but most of his efforts were devoted to his many canvases of subjects from ancient history, literature and the Old Testament. These were sought after by a clientele across Europe, particularly at the Imperial court in Vienna, and Dal Sole declined an invitation to work as court artist to the King of Poland. Dal Sole’s later years were blighted by ill health and, perhaps as a result, his paintings from that period show much less of the dynamism of his earlier works.

The drawing is one of many executed by Dal Sole in a distinctive technique of monochrome oils on a page from a printed book. This grisaille depicts the episode from the Apocrypha in which the virtuous Susannah was surprised while bathing by two elders, who threatened that they would accuse her of adultery if she did not give herself to them. She refused, and at her subsequent trial the young Daniel caused the elders to give conflicting evidence; their fabrication was exposed, and the men were sentenced to death.

Several of these grisailles correspond with surviving paintings by Dal Sole, and it is likely that all were bozzetti for intended paintings. No mention is made of a painting of this subject in the life of Dal Sole written by his friend Giovanni Pietro Zanotti,1 though two lost paintings of Susannah and the Elders by Dal Sole were recorded by Marcello Oretti in his manuscripts on Bolognese painting compiled c. 1760–80, one then in Palazzo Aldrovandi, the other in the collection of Gaetano Gandolfi.2 A second oil grisaille of the subject by Dal Sole survives in a private collection in Milan,3 and it is conceivable that these two grisailles corresponded with the two paintings mentioned by Oretti.

1 Zanotti 1739, i, pp. 289–316.
2 Cited in Thiem 1990, pp. 131, 133.
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adicia
carved surround supporting a pedestal and containing a statue, adapted from Roman use as a framing device for door, window, altarpiece, etc. (from Latin, 'a small house or temple').

barbe
When a panel is framed and then painted (rather than vice versa), this is the ridge of paint which builds up against the frame and becomes especially visible if the original frame is subsequently removed.

braccio
Literally, an arm, the principal unit of length in Italy, around 2 ft (60 cm) but varying between states or cities and sometimes according to what was being measured.

bucranium
A bulls skull as carved or painted architectural decoration.

cabinet
French word first used in the late fifteenth century for a small private room or study, often lavishly decorated or containing a collection of small works of art or natural specimens. The Italians called such a space gabinetto 'cabinet' or camerino 'small room'; the English word was 'closet'. It was related to the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italian term studiolo, 'little study'.

cartellino
A small label of paper or parchment, often bearing a signature or date, painted to look as if it is attached to the surface of a painting.

cartouche
A field containing an image or inscription, with a decorative surround.

chiaroscuro
From the Italian chiaro 'light' and scuro 'dark', the contrast between the two.

contrapposto
A way of posing the standing figure, with the weight borne on one leg, designed to achieve maximum grace and variety in the pose.

cradle
An interlocking lattice of fixed vertical and sliding horizontal wooden bars glued to the reverse of a panel painting in order to repair splits and correct warping, which can create more problems than it solves, and is now rarely used.

craquelure
The pattern of cracks on the surface of an old painting.

cusping
A canvas is stretched prior to painting, either by tacking to a stretcher or attaching with cords to a loom, like a sail. As the canvas strains against the tacks or cords it pulls the weave into a waving pattern along the four edges (sometimes a band as wide as 15 cm is affected). Paint covers the weave, dries, hardens and 'fixes' the waving pattern, which is called 'cusping'. Its presence indicates that a canvas edge has only been trimmed slightly, if at all, in the past.

dipTych
A painting, usually devotional, made up of two hinged panels, which open and close like a book. The backs are often also painted.

egg tempera
A painting medium using yolk of egg; the colour is more opaque and less easy to work than oil, and it dries, hardens and 'fixes' the waving pattern, which is called 'cusping'. Its presence indicates that a canvas edge has only been trimmed slightly, if at all, in the past.

fresco
A technique of painting using pigments suspended in water applied directly on to the wet or fresh (fresco) plaster of a wall or vault.

gesso
An artist's assistant who might also act as a model.

infra-red reflectography
Technique of examining paintings using infra-red radiation. The work is lit and photographed with infra-red lighting and sensing equipment to produce an infra-red reflectograph. Infra-red radiation can penetrate through most upper paint layers but is reflected from the ground; it is, however, absorbed by carbon, present in many drawing media (e.g. charcoal, graphite), allowing a clear image of the artist's underdrawing to be recorded.

lake
Pigment made from organic dye, usually derived from plants or insects. Colours can be red, yellow, russet or yellowish brown. They are generally translucent when mixed with the paint medium and are prone to fading or discolouration.

linen
The technique of repairing or strengthening a canvas painting by gluing a secondary canvas to the back.

lunette
A vault shaped like a cylinder cut in half.

batten
Wooden structural support holding together two planks on the back of a painted panel.

hatching/cross-hatching
In painting, the application of paint in long, thin parallel strokes; in drawing, the use of a series of lines, usually parallel; in both cases to suggest volume, light and shade. Strokes in different directions or crossing one another are known as cross-hatching.

iconoclasm
The destruction of religious images on the grounds that they contravene the second Commandment (Exodus 20: 4).

impasto
Paint applied thickly, with the brushstrokes evident.

impresa
Personal emblem with a motto. Renaissance princes often devised this device themselves, the moral of which is explained by the motto.

imprimatur
See painting layers.

painting layers

pinch
A transparent paint layer modifying or intensifying, rather than concealing, what lies beneath.

gouache
A water-based paint with an effect similar to oil paint.

watercolour, the ratio of pigment to medium is higher, and an opaque substance such as chalk is also present, all of which gives the paint viscosity, body and a semi-matt surface.

ground
See painting layers.

hatching/cross-hatching
In painting, the application of paint in long, thin parallel strokes; in drawing, the use of a series of lines, usually parallel; in both cases to suggest volume, light and shade. Strokes in different directions or crossing one another are known as cross-hatching.

iconoclasm
The destruction of religious images on the grounds that they contravene the second Commandment (Exodus 20: 4).

ignudo
From the Italian for 'nude', any mature naked man used decoratively in a painting, especially those on Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel ceiling.

infrastructure
Paint applied thickly, with the brushstrokes evident.

impresa
Personal emblem with a motto. Renaissance princes often devised this device themselves, the moral of which is explained by the motto.

imprimatur
See painting layers.

infra-red reflectography
Technique of examining paintings using infra-red radiation. The work is lit and photographed with infra-red lighting and sensing equipment to produce an infra-red reflectograph. Infra-red radiation can penetrate through most upper paint layers but is reflected from the ground; it is, however, absorbed by carbon, present in many drawing media (e.g. charcoal, graphite), allowing a clear image of the artist's underdrawing to be recorded.

lake
Pigment made from organic dye, usually derived from plants or insects. Colours can be red, yellow, russet or yellowish brown. They are generally translucent when mixed with the paint medium and are prone to fading or discolouration.

lining/relining
The technique of repairing or strengthening a canvas painting by gluing a secondary canvas to the back.

lunette
A flat, semicircular space on wall or ceiling, which can be framed by arch or vault; a window or work of art in this format.
Mannerism
Artistic style current in Italy and elsewhere during the sixteenth century. The word implies the valuing of artifice over natural observation and complexity over simplicity. When or if it should be applied remains the subject of much debate.

medium
The binding agent for pigments in a painting.

metalpoint
Metal stylus (usually of silver) used as a drawing tool on paper coated with a burnished preparation of ground burnt bone. The silver leaves a fine trace that instantly tarnishes to a grey line.

modello (pl. modelli)
Drawing in which the composition of the final work is fully realised (though usually on a smaller scale), to be presented to a patron for approval.

nimbus
Halo in the form of a solid disc (rather than a hollow ring).

offset
An image generated by pressing or rubbing a chalk drawing or damp print against a blank support to produce a mirror image of the original.

orpiment
An orange crystalline pigment made of arsenic sulphide.

overpaint
An intervention by a later artist or conservator.

painting layers
The structure of a painting is built upon a support (q.v.), usually a panel or canvas. The absorbent surface of the panel or canvas is painted with animal glue (or 'sized') to seal it prior to the application of the ground or priming, which are foundation layers, made up of gesso (gypsum or calcium sulphate dihydrate mixed with animal glue) used on panels to produce a smooth, non-absorbent surface. Ground can also denote the lowest colour layer or layers (which may be applied directly to the sized canvas), usually made up of earth pigments mixed with oil. Underdrawing, a preparatory laying out of the design, is executed directly on the ground using charcoal, chalk, pencil, ink or paint and brush. A thin transparent paint glaze (q.v.) called imprimatura may then be applied to seal and tone the ground before applying subsequent paint layers.

paraph
A mark of ownership, usually in the form of a calligraphic or cryptic set of initials.

pendentive
A concave triangular section of a vault; a classic dome is supported by four pendentives linking the circle of the base of the dome or drum to the four supports (or piers) of the crossing, which themselves lie on a square.

pentimento (pl. pentimenti)
Literally 'repentance', and often anglicised to pentiment, this describes the evidence of an alteration to a painting or drawing suggesting a change of mind on the part of the artist.

pouncing
Transferring a design by rubbing powdered charcoal through holes pricked in a drawing or cartoon (q.v.) to create a dotted underdrawing on a support beneath.

predella
The long horizontal structure supporting the main panels of an altarpiece, often painted with narrative scenes related to the larger images above. (From the Italian for plinth, altar step, or dais.)

prepared paper
Paper prepared by brushing on a coating, either (of ground bone in a binding medium) to provide a microscopically abrasive surface for metalpoint drawing (q.v.), or (of a simple pigment) to give a coloured ground for a drawing.

presentation drawing
A drawing made not as a study but as a finished work of art, as a gift to the artist to a friend or patron; see e.g. Michelangelo’s sheets (nos. 19, 20).

priming
See painting layers.

quadri riportati
Literally 'supported paintings'; an illusion created in frescoes in which the walls and vault appear to be decorated with carved architectural detail hung with framed canvases.

recto and verso
The front and back, respectively, of a drawing (or other two-sided image).

reserve
The space left by an artist when painting one area (such as a piece of drapery), to be filled later with another object (such as a hand).

semi-dome
A dome is a half-sphere; a semi-dome is a quarter-sphere.

shell gold
Powdered gold mixed with a medium to be used as paint. Called shell gold because it was traditionally contained in a mussel or similar shell.

shell
A blue pigment made of finely ground glass coloured with cobalt oxide; much cheaper than ultramarine (q.v.), it was of less intense colour and prone to degradation to a dull grey.

soffit
The underside of an arch.

spalliera
Literally the elements that supported shoulders (spalle), this word described backrests of furniture, and, later, panel paintings set into the wall.

stucco
In Italy, plaster with marble dust mixed into it, used for sculpture and architectural decoration.

studio
See cabinet.

stylus
A drawing instrument consisting of a fine stick of metal, usually silver (see metalpoint). A stylus could be used to produce indentations on the surface of a fresh piece of paper as a colourless underdrawing, or to press through the outlines of a finished design to another support (see cartoon).

support
The underlying structure of an easel painting (as opposed to a wall-painting or fresco [q.v.]), usually a wooden panel, stretched canvas, or sheet of copper.

ultramarine
Italian 'to temper' or 'combine'; one of several paint media (q.v.) which combine pigments with a medium, but usually referring to egg tempera, paint made using the medium of egg yolk.

tondo (pl. tondi)
From the Italian rotondo ('round'); a circular painting or sculptural relief.

underdrawing
See painting layers.

wet-in-wet
A technique of painting used only occasionally during the Renaissance, in which adjoining areas of colour are applied at the same time and allowed to merge in a controlled way.

white heightening
Lead white or white chalk on a drawing to create highlights.

X-radiography
A technique applied to paintings and other artefacts, in which the parts of a painting which block X-radiation most effectively, and which show up clearly as white on radiographs (the "bones"), are the thickly applied layers of paint, rich in metallic compounds (i.e. lead white, which is present in the highlights of flesh paint, as well as tin, mercury, and cadmium-based pigments); the parts which hardly interrupt X-radiation and appear as ghostly grey or dark forms on the radiograph (the "flesh") are the more thinly painted areas, or those containing non-metallic pigments. X-rays may also be partially blocked by the support (q.v.), showing details of the canvas weave, panel construction, nails or battens.
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